DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 337 FL 010 177

TITLE	New York State Conference on Bilingual Education in Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	112p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Community Colleges; Educational Policy; English (Second Language); *Ethnic Studies; Higher Education; *Language Instruction; Language Programs; Language Skills; Multicultural Education; Research Needs; *Second Language Learning; Spanish Speaking; Student Evaluation; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois; New York; Texas

ABSTRACT

This report of a New York State conference on bilingual education in colleges and universities contains opening remarks, keynote addresses, papers, and workshop summaries. Opening remarks were made by Carmen Ana Perez, Emmett Fields, and Lewis P. Welch. Keynote addresses included "Bilingual Education at Hostos Community College" by Candido de Leon and "Teacher-Training for Bilingual Education--School District and Institution of Higher Education Interaction" by Sonia Rivera. The following papers were presented: "Bilingual Certification Provisions in Texas" by Arturo Luis Gutierrez; "Training and Certification of Bilingual/Bicultural Personnel: Some Reflections" by Ernest J. Mazzone; and "The Illinois Experience" by Ned Seelye. Workshop summaries include: "Bilingual Certification" by John Borel and Gilbert Sanchez; "ESL in Bilingual Education" by Mary Hines and Richard L. Light; "The Role of Foreign Languages and Ethnic Studies in Bilingual Education" by Edna Acosta and Charles R. Hancock; "Improving Literacy Skills in Two Languages" by Edgar Rodriguez and Gloria Zuazua; "Lobbying" by Lee Wolfe; "Assessing Competencies in Bilingual Education" by Migdalia Romero de Ortiz and Lourdes Travieso; and "Research Needs in Bilingual Education" by Marietta Saravia Shore. Appendices on the conference program and resolutions are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED168337

NEW YORK STATE CONFERENCE ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

MAY 13/14, 1976
HOWARD JOHNSON'S MOTOR LODGE
ALBANY, NEW YORK

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan A. Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Sponsored by the

Bilingual Education Program
State University of New York at Albany

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

OPENING REMARKS

Carmen Ana Pérez, Director, Bilingual Education, S.U.N.Y. - Albany. . . . 1
Emmett Fields, President, S.U.N.Y. - Albany 3
Lewis P. Welch, Vice-President University Affairs
S.U.N.Y. - Albany 5

KEYNOTE ADDRESSES

Bilingual Education at Hostos Community College
Cándido de León, President, Hostos Community College 6

Teacher-Training for Bilingual Education - School District and Institution of Higher Education Interaction
Soñia Rivera, Luis Brandeis High School 14

PAPERS PRESENTED

Bilingual Certification Provisions in Texas
Arturo Luis Gutiérrez 22

Training and Certification of Bilingual/Bicultural Personnel: Some Reflections
Ernest J. Mazzone, Director, Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education, Massachusetts Dept. of Education 27

The Illinois Experience
Ned Seelye, Acting Director, Bilingual Education, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Illinois 37

WORKSHOP SUMMARIES

Bilingual Certification
John Borel, New York State Education Department
Gilbert Sánchez, S.U.N.Y. - Albany 48

ESL in Bilingual Education
Mary Hines, La Guardia Community College
Richard L. Light, S.U.N.Y. - Albany 50

The Role of Foreign Languages and Ethnic Studies in Bilingual Education
Edna Acosta - Belén, S.U.N.Y. - Albany
Charles R. Hancock, S.U.N.Y. - Albany 52

Improving Literacy Skills in Two Languages
Edgar Rodríguez, S.U.N.Y. - New Paltz
Gloria Zuazua, Brooklyn College 59

Page

Lobbying
Lee Wolfe, Education Analyst, New York State Senate 64

Assessing Competencies in Bilingual Education
Migdalia Romero de Ortiz, Hunter College
Lourdes Travieso, Bilingual Office, New York City 66

Research Needs in Bilingual Education
Marietta Saravia Shore, Hunter College 70

APPENDIX

1. Conference Program 99
2. Resolution No. 2 passed by the TESOL Legislative Assembly, March 5, 1976. New York on Teacher Certification 103
3. Accreditation Recommendations 104
4. Resolution No. 3 passed by the TESOL Legislative Assembly, March 5, 1976, New York - Resolution on CBTE 105
5. Hostos Community College Statement 107

INTRODUCTION TO THE CONFERENCE

Carmen A. Perez

Last spring, while we were planning our bilingual program at SUNY-Albany, we realized that there are many individuals within the SUNY system with an interest and expertise in various areas of bilingual education. These persons, located at different campuses, have no structure for getting together to discuss or share this common interest. The faculty of the SUNY-Albany Bilingual Education Program decided, therefore, to take steps to facilitate communication and establish a working relationship among bilingual educators within the SUNY system. The objectives were general in order to be able to include as many interested persons as possible in the formulation of the final organizational structure and the identification of specific objectives.

A series of regional meetings were held in the fall and early spring at Brockport, Rochester, and New York City. Although the original plan did not include the involvement of non-SUNY institutions, this was modified early through the intervention of Professors Jose Vazquez and Armando Cotayo of Hunter College. They liked our idea and insisted that we broaden our plans to include all persons working in bilingual education programs at institutions of higher education in New York State. We were delighted with this suggestion, especially since both gentlemen volunteered to work on the project with us, a promise they kept and for which we are very grateful.

Some of the many interesting ideas, concerns and issues discussed at the regional meetings became the topics for the workshops you will be attending this morning. Our plan for today, therefore, is to share some of our concerns with our colleagues in the State.

Although we don't expect to find solutions for all of our problems, perhaps we can share ideas on how things are being done at different places. The success of this conference and the structure of any organization which emerges depends on you, the participant. We would like to plan a follow-up conference for next spring, with perhaps regional meetings during the year. Give us your ideas and suggestions.

The Bilingual Education Program at SUNY-Albany has received a great deal of support and assistance from many people at the University. You have been greeted by some of them this morning, including Dr. Moore, the Dean of the School of Education, and Dr. Snyder, Chairperson of the Department of Instruction. Both gentlemen always have time to help us find solutions for our problems and to give us encouragement and support. Let me introduce to you other persons who have also given us help and with whom we work very closely:

Dr. Sipe, former Chairperson of the Department of Instruction, has been the "padrino" of our program from the very beginning. I would also like to introduce to you Rafael Bosch, Chairperson of the Department of Hispanic and Italian Studies, who is very involved in our efforts. The last two persons I want you to meet are Edna Acosta-Belen, Chairperson of the Department of Puerto Rican Studies, and Richard Light, professor of English as a Second Language. They began the bilingual education program at SUNY-Albany in 1970 and have lent their support to it ever since.

I hope you have a pleasant, fruitful day and that we have a successful conference.

GREETINGS

Emmett Fields

The other day, someone asked me how long I have been President. I said that it has been eight years since last July! It has been an eventful year. I bring greetings to this conference, my compliments to its founding officers, and my great hopes are shared with you for the future of biligual education.

The State University of New York at Albany is committed to bilingual education. There are a variety of reasons for this. I think two are most outstanding. The first is that bilingual education is one of the few (and advancing) areas of growth and importance to the people of this country, and not least to the people of New York State. It is hard for me to think of a new development in our area of education in the last decade which has had more human import in it. I applaud all of you for sharing your thoughts as to what it should mean, and for building out of it an educational future of such importance. The second reason is that our antecedents, the antecedents of the University of Albany, are those of a proud and noble teachers' college, and it was one of the most distinguished of such colleges in the state, if not the most. The state has depended on it in the past and it should continue to depend on it in the future, in ways that bring new life to higher education.

I sense that constraints, if not educational necessities, propel us to look at the work of SUNY and all of its campuses, and beyond that, to the independent colleges and universities of the state more as our partners than we have in the past. The idea flooding through these circles, and shaping out opinions impressively, is the idea and concession which would allow us to pool our efforts. I believe this is the "name of the game" in the upcoming decade.

I hope the conference is very successful and achieves its intended goals.

partners than we have in the past. The idea flooding through these circles, and shaping our opinions impressively, is the idea and concession which would allow us to pool our efforts. I believe this is the "name of the game" in the upcoming decade.

I hope the conference is very successful and achieves its intended goals.

WELCOME

Lewis P. Welch

It's a pleasure to welcome you to this important conference on behalf of the University at Albany. I especially would like to commend the organizers of the conference, Carmen and Gil, for the intensive program that they have planned for you. I am sure that the sessions you will participate in will produce the agenda of issues and recommendations which are the next steps necessary in going forward with plans for consortiums or other forms of cooperative programming.

The current economic climate of the State and its effect on higher education now make it more urgent than ever that we seek to develop more joint and cooperative educational programs that involve more than one college; more than one university. Not only is this a realistic response to the situation we now face, but it is also a unique opportunity that we have as part of the largest system of public and private education in the nation.

Partnership in education is not easy work. It is demanding and frustrating but the results can be satisfying and significant. The strength of a combined enterprise is usually much greater than the sum of its parts. However, the achievement of collaboration is a very sensitive and delicate assignment.

I join you all in the hope that your work will lead to important results not only in your own field and in your own program, but even more significantly, as a model for other program leaders in other fields to follow. You are engaged in pioneering future-oriented exploration. The benefits, moreover, can be long lasting and many. We are pleased that our campus could serve as host for this meeting and we trust that you will find your investment of time and energy in this conference personally and professionally beneficial.

I wish you good luck.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AT HOSTOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Cándido de León

I would like to discuss what we at Hostos visualize or conceive of as bilingual education, and then reflect over the past few years at the college, so that we can compare some of the ideals with the actual practices in order to better understand what bilingual education can mean at the university level. We must look at the human resources first; this is our real concern. There are many adults, thousands of them, who cannot succeed in this society because they cannot use their talents and cannot do anything to ameliorate their lives or those of their families, unless they can obtain a higher education.

Bilingual education at Hostos includes four specific aspects. The first one is the continuing use of Spanish. I refer to Spanish because that is the language group with which we are primarily involved; although, at present, we have a sizeable number of students who come from Haiti. The second aspect of the program is the use of English developed via an intensive English language program. The third component of the bilingual program is Spanish as a second language, and the fourth is what we refer to as the bicultural component, which is not simply a question of sharing different folklore, customs, and so on.

The easiest way to understand the term "human resources" is to discuss the need for bilingual education in the city of New York and the need to use Spanish for instruction. In 1970, when the college commenced, about 38% of the students were Hispanic. As of last September 65.5% of our students are Hispanic with 38% of them being Puerto Ricans, 17-18% Dominican, and the remaining 9% from other Hispanic backgrounds. The significance of this is that approximately

half of the freshman class required instruction through Spanish in the liberal arts classes because they lacked a sufficient command of English. Each year the number of students whose dominant language is Spanish increases about 5%.

Who are these students? Eight-five percent of our students are 21 years or older. We are not only referring to recent high school graduates, since only 15% of our freshman class consists of this group. The median age of our students ranges from 25 to 27 years old. We are dealing primarily with a population of adults, most of whom are married, have responsibilities, and are aware that without some form of higher education they will not be able to get a better job or achieve their aspirations.

I will give you three examples of what I consider typical cases of students who succeed: A woman named Raquel attended classes accompanied by her two children. This is not an unusual occurrence among women who enter the college because many are unable to have someone care for their children. Had Raquel not been able to take her liberal arts courses in Spanish, she would not have been as successful in college. She took math and social science courses in Spanish while participating in an intensive English program. Regarding this aspect of the program, critics often raise the following questions: What happens to the students when they complete the program? Aren't you harming them by teaching them in Spanish? Raquel went on to Lehman College, where she graduated after two years with a 3.9 average. She was awarded a scholarship and obtained her master's degree in bilingual counseling. She went to work in a drug addiction program and is presently studying toward her doctoral degree.

A significant point concerning the above pattern is that 86% of our graduates elect to return to work in a service field. The national average of students who go back to work in the social service area is 59%. These figures are the result of a survey which we conducted for the purpose of finding out

what happens to our students. Raquel exemplifies our students. She is obviously a highly talented woman whose only obstacle was her insufficient command of English. She was able to complete her studies and is now involved in helping others improve their economic and social situations.

The second example is that of a woman who returned to school at 35 years of age and completed all of her work in one year. Our critics believed this was impossible. They questioned the success of her feat, insinuating that we gave her the grades. She, however, went on to Queens College where she completed her junior and senior years in a single academic year. This woman also went on to earn a master's degree.

One student I have been observing is a man who was drafted in Puerto Rico and remained in the army for approximately twelve years. His actual ambition was to study math so that he could teach it. He is in his late 30's now and has had every math course we have to offer, with the purpose of observing teaching techniques. This is a man who would never have been able to enter one of the other units of the City University.

The point of this discussion is that there is a great deal of talent that is going to waste. We often hear of children who need bilingual education but I think we ignore adults with similar needs. Many of the universities in this country are just beginning to respond to the needs of adult education. There are many talented adults who are not in our program but who would succeed if they were given the opportunity. No one has to apologize for teaching in the students' native language,while students are learning the predominant language of that country which will enable them to enter into that society.

Our approach at Hostos is to offer all liberal arts courses in Spanish. If you have seen children become excited when their language is used for instruction, you can't imagine what happens to an adult when he realizes that

he can learn things through Spanish in New York City. The level of ignorance that persists about using another language is amazing. Consider, for example, the reactions of university level faculty and administrators who visit the college. They enter a chemistry class, observe that it is being taught in Spanish, and question its validity -- as if the chemical would take on a different form if you used Spanish.

When the College of the City of New York decided there weren't enough institutions providing health programs, we were asked to offer instruction in health. The important thing for many of our students is that while they are getting all of their instruction in the liberal arts area in Spanish, they can then go through the intensive English program in preparation for courses in the allied health area in English. We have deliberately avoided teaching nursing, dental hygiene or radiology in Spanish because students have to take examinations in English.

What do we do with the students when they come to the College? First of all, we administer a series of tests in Spanish and English to determine their reading, writing, and mathematics level. The tests are not used for admission purposes, but rather to place the students into appropriate classes. One of the amazing observations we have made from the test results is that many New York City high school graduates are Spanish dominant. They have to be placed in English as a Second Language courses because they have never really learned English. We have found that about 20% of the entering students read at a 12th grade level and 17 percent below the 6th grade level. I am emphasizing this because of some of the insane notions proposed for keeping students out of the university by using reading scores. The significant thing is not what students are able to do when they come in, but rather that the average student who goes through the program is able to improve his performance on reading tests by 1.9 years for each semester that he is at the college.

The program is designed so that remedial courses are scheduled with content area courses. A student who is weak in writing skills will take a course in English composition with an elective course. For example, students interested in Puerto Rican history will take it as an elective and write term papers required in the composition course on topics related to Puerto Rican history. The composition teacher observes the class on Puerto Rican history periodically so that assignments can be coordinated with discussions taking place in the history class. The history teacher also works with the composition instructor and gives assignments relevant to the skills being emphasized. This system has been developed over the past 5 years by the instructional staff. One aspect that holds true is that the students are able to progress beyond their own expectations.

A major goal of the continued use of Spanish is to develop pride in speaking and writing correctly, among students who have become extremely careless about their use of Spanish. Last year a group of Hispanic students who have grown up in New York and have had no formal training in Spanish grammar or syntax, requested a special course in Spanish composition for Hispanics. The course established has been a great experience for all involved. Three years ago a group of students approached me with the protest that they were only receiving six hours of intensive English a week and they wanted nine. They didn't want more credits; they wanted more time to improve their skills in the English language. This could only happen in an environment where students know that everyone is making an effort and is supporting them. It is also helpful when faculty members make themselves available 4 or 5 hours a day to help students. These are some key elements in having the college function successfully on a bilingual basis.

The third element is Spanish as a second language. Many of our programs call themselves bilingual, but in fact teach only in English. Whether it is on the elementary or the university level, bilingual education frequently means

teaching English to Spanish speaking students. What has been ignored is the teaching of Spanish to the English speaking population. This is particularly important in New York where many persons spend years preparing to become social workers, legal assistants, nurses, etc., and then, despite all their professional preparation and eagerness can't ask, "What's your name? Who are you? What's your problem?" in a language that people understand. Persons in the health area have returned to school because they recognize their need to learn conversational Spanish. Policemen, legal assistants, and college presidents have requested enrollment in Spanish courses -- as long as they could attend secretly. I think many of them feel no one should know that they still have something to learn.

There is a great deal we could do in the area of Spanish as a second language, and politically, this is one of the strongest elements that we could use to get support and begin eliminating the attitude of, "When I came into this country" or "when my father came into this country, we had to learn English." One way we might gain the support of service workers is by demonstrating how bilingual skills will make them more effective in their position.

The fourth component, which I consider the most important, and perhaps the most difficult, is the bicultural aspect. We are 38% Hispanic, 32% black, and 30% white, giving us enough members of each group to allow significant interaction to take place. The faculty members recognize that the Puerto Rican, Black, or White who sees himself as a "super-liberal" may not recognize the many discriminatory racial practices that can be a part of his behavior. This recognition does not take place until a very significant situation arises, such as the discovery that someone else got a promotion before he did. All of a sudden the spirit of equality for others goes right down the drain, and prejudices

begin to emerge. This part has been ignored because traditionally when we speak about biculturalism, we have spoken about products outside of us -- artistic products, dances, music, etc., which are quite valid. I am not suggesting that we should stop that. However, what we have ignored most of all is ourselves and who we are as a result of the experiences we have had.

Those of us who maintain this bicultural existence, without becoming schizophrenic, have moved in and out of the situation and frequently ignore the strains that are put on us. I have tried to create and establish some way of bringing these things out in the open so that everyone involved in that process of coming together gets to know one another better and can function better as human beings. The entire process, whether you talk about the administrators, the faculty members, or the students, is one of the richest experiences for learning.

My experiences with the City University, which is not a typical university, have lead me to realize that we are not all involved in a search for truth. The first time you get caught up in departmental or university politics, you find out that the search for truth is only quoted by somebody who is on top. On the other hand, if you happen to be on the bottom, or in the middle, there isn't much discussion or quotation of truth, and beauty, and the rest. However, one advantage that this arrangment has for our own development is that everyone has the possibility of growing and developing personally, and as a result of that personal development, there is something to offer and something to bring into the lives of students and faculty members. The other side of it is summarized in the letter which I would like to read to you. As an administrator one day you might get a letter like this. This is dated January 15, 1976. It is addressed to me because of my request to have this in writing:

"Pursuant to our conversation of last week, regarding Spanish speaking students who have been allocated to the SEEK program and do not speak English, my office has done a survey of the Spring 1976 entering freshmen. As of this date, we have found approximately 28 students from City College who would fall into the aforementioned category." (The significant thing about this is that it took 12 years, from '64 to '76, for them to recognize that there are students who do not speak English!) "Since City College does not have the facilities to accommodate non-English speaking students, it will be necessary to make some arrangements for study that will meet their particular needs. As far as we have been able to ascertain, Hostos if the only college within the CUNY system that is capable of providing intense preparation in English for a non-English-speaking Spanish student, while also providing academic instruction in Spanish. Therefore, we propose an interim arrangement that will allow these students to take courses at Hostos College, from City College, for the Spring, 1976 semester. After we have been able to determine the magnitude of this problem, we would like to enter into discussion with your college to develop a more comprehensive solution. I would appreciate hearing further from you on this matter."

One month after I received this letter, the New York Times reported the Chancellor's proposal to close Hostos and merge it with Bronx Community College. I mention this because the bilingual program and its success, is one aspect of it, and politics is another aspect of it. But, if you are going to make waves, you had better make sure that you are in the boat!

Thank you.

TEACHER TRAINING FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
SCHOOL DISTRICT AND INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION INTERACTION

Sonia M. Rivera

Dissatisfaction with teacher-training programs has been an ongoing controversy in American education for quite some time. All too often, even today in an era of rapid change, many teachers feel the training they receive at the college or university level bears little or no relevancy to the real-life situations they face in the classroom. Still today, school administrators as well as teachers rebel against what they consider to be the burden of educational innovations, conceived by intelligent, well meaning but impractical, college or university professors. Colleges and universities on the other hand, often view the resistance to change on the part of the school as a mechanism designed to defend themselves against criticism charging inadequacy and ineffectiveness. Each institution's perceptions of its specific role(s) as well as its organizational patterns, tend to add other stumbling blocks to effective communication. Bilingual/bicultural education has the potential to be a strong vehicle for developing firm, continuous and mutually enriching liaisons between institutions of higher learning, elementary and secondary schools, and the communities they are designed to serve.

One of the underlying concepts for bilingual/bicultural education is cultural pluralism. Slowly but surely there appears to be recognition that as a people, the residents of this nation are not all alike. The "melting-pot" theory is gradually losing credibility and is being replaced by other analogies such as, "the salad bowl," or, "the mosaic," wherein the distinction of each piece can be clearly seen and yet forms part of the whole. It has even seeped into Country and Western music. Just listen to Charlie Rich's rendition of "America

the Beautiful" currently enjoying popularity. In it, he includes lines in Spanish, German, Italian, etc., as related to specific geographical areas and peoples within this nation. However superficial this may seem, it indicates a growing recognition of cultural pluralism. The most comprehensive definition of cultural pluralism to date is the one developed by the National Coalition for Cultural Pluralism. It reads in part:

> Cultural pluralism is a state of equal co-existence in a mutually supportive environment within the boundaries or framework of one nation, of people of diverse cultures with significantly different patterns of belief, behavior, color and in many cases with different languages.

Those who truly believe in the intrinsic value of bilingual/bicultural education must also believe in, and strive for cultural pluralism. Without this concommitant belief, bilingual/bicultural education will always remain in the compensatory mold, and true bilingual/bicultural education will never become a reality in this nation.

Acceptance of the concept of cultural pluralism implies acceptance of the fact that changes, some very basic ones, must occur in many American institutions, among them the schools and institutions of higher learning. This factor brings us to one of the areas wherein these two institutions, as well as the community(ies) they are designed to serve, must collaborate and communicate - the reassessment of educational goals and values and their relationship to society at large.

From Brown vs. Board of Education in 1954, through the sixties, America, because of the persistence and patience of its civil rights marchers, the riots of its urban ghettoes, the loud insistence of its rebellious and alienated youth, began to question its values, attitudes and behaviors. This inquiry involved not only its minority citizens, but also the values and goals which the majority had set for themselves and had so assidiously worked to achieve. Ironically, as this

nation approaches its Bicentennial, many of these concerns appear to have been discarded. Undoubtedly, this state is partly due to the excruciating emotional pain which true self-examination can cause as well as our present economic situation. Nonetheless, if we are to effectively implement the concepts of bilingual/bicultural education and, by extension, that of cultural pluralism, that spirit of self-examination must be revived.

The collaboration of schools, institutions of higher education, and community, must be grounded in the sincere belief that all three have resources of equal importance to offer, and secondly in the commitment to meaningfully capitalize on them.

This process of reassessment will undoubtedly bring about changes in teacher training. It is not our intent to imply that there has been a total lack of change either on the part of schools or institutions of higher learning. But though it is not necessary to bring before this audience a historical overview of the resurgence of bilingual/bicultural education in this nation, I do think it important that we reflect on the fact that the institution of bilingual/bicultural instructional programs in elementary and secondary schools preceded any meaningful effort to adequately train the personnel needed to effectively implement them. Colleges and universities had somewhat reluctantly responded to needs of its culturally different clients by the development of ethnic studies programs. In many institutions of higher learning, the development of training programs for bilingual/bicultural education was kindled by the availability of federal funds for this purpose. As a matter of fact, one of the current fears of administrators of bilingual/bicultural education programs is that once federal funds are no longer available, such programs will cease to exist. Often these programs have been instituted without the necessary in-depth thought processes or commitments and, in some cases, without the adequate personnel

essential to their effectiveness and institutionalization. Indirectly, this factor provides the opportunity for joint effort and work to bring about those changes which all deem necessary. The changes to be made in teacher training for bilingual/bicultural education cannot be made solely in the organization, administration or curriculum of said programs, but they also must pay attention to the doubts, fears, motivations and problems of all those involved in the process. This includes:

1. parents,
2. students,
3. teachers, prospective teachers, and
4. administrators both at the university as well as at the local school level.

Furthermore, those of us involved in bilingual/bicultural education must strive for the eradication of the belief that teacher-training ends upon our receiving paper credentials. More credence must be given to the often heard comment that certification only gives a person the right to begin to teach. This idea becomes particularly important simply because culture does not remain static, it changes, and as it does, it becomes essential that institutions keep in step.

The mechanisms for the implementation of joint institutions of higher education, local education agencies and community activity take a variety of forms. They include, among other methods, conferences of this type. It is not easy for a field practioner to come before those who deal with the theoretical levels of bilingual/bicultural education. A field practioner must often make decisions without the chance or luxury to think of all the possible ramifications of his/her actions. In like manner, some of you probably make decisions without a clear assessment as to what their implications are for the field's implementation of them. Because of the sense of urgency to respond to the many needs of our communities and the sometimes virulent attacks against bilingual/bicultural

education, we labor under great pressure and tension and seldom get the chance to sit back, reflect and try to synthesize the myriad of experiences, theories, practices, etc. regarding bilingual/bicultural education. Conferences, when carefully structured, can facilitate this most necessary interaction.

Another forum for joint action is that of advisory councils. One of the side effects of the infusion of federal funds into education has been the emergence of advisory boards, sometimes called consultative councils, parent boards, or community boards for educational programs. The degree to which these boards influence educational policy and practice differs sufficiently so as to prevent any generalizations as to their effectiveness in their stated function. Nonetheless, they can be structured in a manner that will insure collaborative action. Those who serve on boards know the frustrations and agonies such services can cause. Quite often there is the feeling that school and/or program administrators are not truly listening to the concerns of the board or council. Thus it becomes essential that:

1. councils include a cross-segment of all parties involved in bilingual/bicultural education in a given community.
2. all concerned parties develop the interaction skills that foster meaningful communication.

It is more difficult, however, to pinpoint the designs for interaction between local education agencies and institutions of higher education, and the community, regarding the structure and content of the various components of teacher training programs. It should, however, be noted that if training programs are the sole products of the institutions of higher education, they will not answer the needs of the student currently serviced by bilingual/bicultural education. If the areas of practicum experience, research and development of teacher competencies are somewhat summarily examined, this factor will be obvious.

For example, let us view competency based teacher education within the context of bilingual/bicultural education. As noted previously, the instructional programs at the school level have preceded any coordinated training designs for bilingual/bicultural education at the institution of higher education level. Thus, if given the opportunity, it would be possible for school district personnel to specify a large number of the skills which experience has shown must be in the repertoire of the staff of bilingual/bicultural programs. For example, given the federal funding of bilingual/bicultural education at this particular time, the area of evaluation has assumed tremendous importance. It becomes important that the prospective personnel of bilingual/bicultural programs have a thorough background in educational research and a very specific awareness and understanding of cultural implications on educational research. It may be argued that this skill should apply to all educators, but one may counter-respond that few educational programs are faced with the critics (some quite fearful and hostile) of bilingual/bicultural education who demand "immediate if not sooner" statistical proof that the process is indeed a valid educational alternative.

Partially because of this unbearable pressure, but more importantly because of funding requirements, programs are boxed into using instruments which are invalid and unreliable tools (though they are "standardized") for measuring student progress. It is a recognized fact that there is a severe paucity of adequate tests for use in bilingual/bicultural education. Furthermore, how can some of the benefits of bilingual/bicultural education be measured, such as a positive self-image within the framework of a culture that differs from that of the mainstream? Local school districts can work with institutions of higher education, wherein the climate and facilities are more amenable to research towards pinpointing areas of priority for the development of evaluative instruments as well as other areas for meaningful research. It should be noted that

all collaborative research cannot be of the esoteric nature which is so characteristic of much of today's work in education, but must be structured in a manner that will assure results that can be implemented directly or indirectly in classroom situations.

The diversification of practicum experiences in recent times, provides another opportunity for joint school, college or university and community action. Student-teaching and classroom observations have been supplemented by field practice, internships and other on-site activities which tend to give the prospective teacher more practical experiences. Of the above experiences, the one which schools find particularly meaningful is that of the internship. Quite often, the future educator not only becomes familiar with a functioning educational program, but he/she becomes a working participant in its processes and procedures.

The implementation of this type of experience should be continued and broadened to include community agencies and services which directly or indirectly influence the lives of students in bilingual/bicultural programs. The school's participation in the design of such activities can take into account practical situations, such as scheduling, which can make the experience more fruitful for the trainee.

Undoubtedly, a more profound analysis of the multiplicity of factors which will affect the situations and ideas discussed hertofore is necessary and essential. Nonetheless, it is important to remember that those of us involved in bilingual/bicultural education have the opportunity to become one of the most creative forces in American education in the near future. (Congress, funding, and other forces permitting) We cannot afford to become disheartened if at times we seem to come upon one stumbling block after another, or if we don't find the immediate solution to the problems which confront us. It is important that we remember the words of the Spanish poet, Machado: "Caminante, no hay

camino, se hace camino al andar," which not too adequately translated means, "Traveler, there is no road - you construct it as you walk."

BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION PROVISIONS IN TEXAS

Arturo Luis Gutiérrez, PhD.

Recommendations for teacher certification in Texas are a function of the colleges and universities in the state which have teacher preparation programs approved by the State Board of Education. Certificates are granted by the commissioner of education upon application by eligible persons. In regards to bilingual education, legislation enacted by the 63rd Texas Legislature states:

> The State Board of Education shall promulgate rules and regulations governing the issuance of teaching certificates with bilingual education endorsements to teachers who possess a speaking and reading ability in a language other than English in which bilingual education programs are offered and who meet the general requirements....(Sec. 21.459(a), Texas Education Code)

In developing standards for programs in teacher education, the State Board of Education provides each approved institution with a statement of the general qualifications required for each area where a teaching certificate is authorized. However, in accordance with Section 13.032(c) Texas Education Code:

> ...The board may not require an institution to teach a particular doctrine or to conduct instruction on the basis of, or in accordance with, any particular pedagogical method, whether expressed in terms of behavioral or performance based objectives, competencies, or other explicit assessment devices....

Following is a summary of the standards issued by the State Board of Education in accordance with current statutes for the fulfillment of the certificate program requirements for bilingual education.

The bilingual teacher preparation program can be either an area of specialization on the Elementary Teaching Certificate or a teaching field on

the High School and Junior High School certificates. Both the area of specialization and the teaching field consists of 24 semester hours (12 of which must be junior level or above), which include studies in the following six components:

1. Foundation Component -

   Studies emphasizing:

   a. The rationale for bilingual education; and

   b. An orientation to the statewide program of bilingual education

2. Linguistics Component -

   Studies in Linguistics which include Descriptive Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, Psycho Linguistics, and Contrastive Linguistics in English and the language of the target population for the Bilingual Certification.

3. Methodology Component -

   Methodology studies designed to develop skills and techniques in teaching:

   a. English as a second language;

   b. The language of the target population as a first and second language;

   c. Reading in English, and in the language of the target population; and

   d. Appropriate subject matter in the language of the target population for the Bilingual Certification (subject matter to be taught in the language of the target population)

4. Psychological Component -

   Studies of the principles of Educational Psychology (including testing) as applied to children or youth in a Bilingual Education Program

5. Cultural Component -

   Studies emphasizing the:

   a. Concepts of the cultural, and cultural patterns of the target population; and

   b. Cultural contributions of the target population to the region

6. Language Component -

   Studies of the standardized dialect of the target population which will serve to expand the teacher's existing command of that language. A demonstrated proficiency at the teaching level in the language of the target population, and in English must be achieved prior to the college recommendation. Basic language study as such is not to be included as a component of the Bilingual Program. Advanced language study shall not consist of more than six of the 24 semester hours.

In addition to the above, there are certain requirements which apply to both program staff and the institutional setting. It has often been said that the success of any program depends on the preparation of the staff and the commitment of the institution. Therefore, the college or university approved to prepare bilingual education teachers must have:

1. At least one full-time specialist in charge, who has:

   a. A doctor's degree with a concentration in bilingual studies (a minimum of 12 graduate hours)

   b. Three years teaching experience in a bilingual context

   c. An awareness of the multi-ethnic composition of the region

   d. Proficiency on the college teaching level in both English and the language of the target population

any deviation from the stated requirements must be reflective of an equivalency of, or greater than, the stipulated requirements and evidence of the same must be presented for approval review.

2. Sufficient supporting staff members who have:
   a. A minimum of a master's degree with a concentration in bilingual studies
   b. Three years teaching experience in a bilingual context
   c. An awareness of the multi-ethnic composition of the region
   d. Proficiency on the college teaching level in both English and the language of the target population

   The total faculty of an institution's Bilingual Studies Program must reflect comprehensive preparation and experience in all program components

The college or university preparing bilingual teachers must provide:

1. An environment conducive to a Bilingual Teacher Education Program
2. Facilities containing media, books, periodicals and material appropriate for Bilingual Education, to afford the student the opportunity for research and study
3. Opportunity for the student to engage in guided observation and student teaching in established Bilingual Education Programs as well as other quality programs.

The student teaching component is a part of the area of professional education. The student teaching experience must be designed to include experience in a bilingual classroom at the appropriate level of the certificate program and must provide for student teaching through both English and the language of the target population.

In October,1968, prior to the enactment of any State or Federal legislation in Bilingual Education, one Texas institution of higher education had been approved by the State Board of Education for a pilot bilingual teacher preparation program. In the next five years, seven additional institutions of higher education were given approval for pilot projects. However, since the enactment of state bilingual legislation mandating the issuance of teaching certificates with bilingual education endorsements (Section 21.459 (a), Texas Education Code) in 1973, and the subsequent issuance of bilingual certification provisions by the State Board of Education, Texas has had phenomenal growth in the number of institutions of higher education that have implemented approved programs for the preparation of bilingual education teachers. To date, there are 28 colleges and universities with approved bilingual teacher preparation programs. Of these, 28 have undergraduate programs, 6 have both graduate and undergraduate programs, and 1 has only a graduate program.

TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION OF BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL PERSONNEL - SOME REFLECTIONS

Ernest J. Mazzone

The whole matter of teacher education and certification is an intricate, and sometimes uncertain and poorly defined process, which nevertheless forges ahead, producing and licensing personnel to service the needs of school children. The magnitude of the work force itself portrays the enormity of the issue. There are in the United States approximately 2.5 million teachers and administrators servicing some 51 million elementary and secondary school students (Digest of Educational Statistics: Washington, D.C.: U.S.O.E., 1970). Teachers' salaries account for a substantial part of the more than 50 billion dollars needed to operate the schools. In these days of tremendous fiscal constraints and taxpapers' exasperations, two questions loom large. Consider first this one: Do schools make a difference?

You will recall that James Coleman and his colleagues in their monumental work, Equality of Educational Opportunity, concluded the following:

> "....One implication stands out above all: that schools bring little influence to bear upon a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general school context; and that this very lack of independent effect means that the inequalities imposed upon children by their home, neighborhood, and peer environment are carried along to become the inequalities with which they confront adult life at the end of the school." (James S. Coleman, et al: Equality of Educational Opportunity; Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, Page 325.)

On this point there is contrary evidence and an overwhelming intuition on the part of many educators and others, and especially in this supply-demand economy which clearly states that, "yes, dollars do make a difference, and clearly the more dollars spent on education, the greater the return. Perhaps this paper should have started with this question: Do teachers make a difference?"

It is clear that cost quality studies and socio-economic studies do not really give us clear answers about the schools. But there is a body of evidence that shows that schools that do try to combine experiential background of children with their learning styles and their needs, along with the human element, do indeed make a difference. As you know, most of the research in the past has used inappropriate criteria to measure the schooling process. High quality school facilities, equipment, appropriate instructional supplies, and other items such as school libraries are important, but they are not in themselves sufficient for learning.

On the other hand, the human interaction element is of crucial importance. Many studies have attempted to capture this interaction, but because it is difficult to capture, various kinds of variables have been used. For example, the age or the experience of the teacher, the teacher's education level, the teacher's salary, and the number of books used in the classroom have all been considered. Of course, these are not measures of what humans do, nor are they capable of measuring whether or not a school is effective. But the weight of the evidence does indicate that dollars do make a difference in the quality of school services that a child receives.

In 1970, the U. S. Office of Education reported in its school effectiveness studies that the presence of particular qualities found in greater supply in schools could to be linked with higher levels of student learning. In fifteen of the seventeen studies, the most important set of variables were those relating either to the quality of the teacher, (verbal ability, experience level, degree level), or frequency of the student's contact with professionals which included: teacher-pupil ratios. class size, or the number of counselors in a school. (U. S. Office of Education: Do Teachers Make a Difference? Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970) While these studies

did not measure the actions of teachers, since they focused on teacher characteristics, when computed on average, the effectiveness of the school was in evidence. Many educators at the state, federal, and local levels, many laymen, and others, (including legislators, the creators of laws for teacher certification), have been working for a long time under the basic assumptions underlying the evidence--poor as it is--that appears to say that teachers do make a difference.

If this is so, then teacher education institutions and state departments of education charged with the training and licensing of professionals also have a large and difficult responsibility of seeing the products of their institutions are indeed capable of making a difference. This principal is no more clearly evident than in the field of bilingual/bicultural education.

Let me carry this point further, and deal briefly with the implications of these facts on the level of bilingual/bicultural personnel needs and competencies. The availability of competent bilingual-bicultural teachers sensitive to the needs of children of limited English-speaking ability, particularly in urban and rural areas, is one of the most pressing problems needing attention in bilingual education programs. Having become a teacher through training in English, with the added ability to speak English, does not prepare a teacher for Spanish-medium work. Adequate knowledge of a "language" by a teacher means knowledge of the literature, songs, folklore, geography, dialects, history, and other factors which relate to the people who speak any given languages.

Although teachers play a key role in the instructional process, the role of other service personnel must also be considered. Obviously, when we speak of personnel involved in an instructional program we think immediately of administrators, supervisors, and other support people such as counselors. In addition, we sometimes include speech therapists, psychologists, librarians, aides, parents, and other members of the community. It is clear that a good program

will involve all of these personnel and others. It is also clear that all of these personnel will require special training for an effective bilingual program.

In spite of increases in teachers' salary scales in the cities and elsewhere, the financial crisis remains critical. Due to the shrinking tax base and the increased demands of other city agencies for tax aid, the cities are finding it increasingly difficult to pay the salaries which will attract sufficient qualified personnel. The pressures in today's urban schools--numerous antiquated buildings and facilities, demanding teaching conditions and the real presence of student and community unrest--makes it very difficult to attract competent and experienced teachers to urban teaching. Add to this the fact that there is indeed a relatively small resource bank available from which to choose.

A close look at the experience level of bilingual teachers in most large urban cities will show that the average salary of bilingual teachers is well below the mean for non-bilingual teachers. This fact is demonstrated in Boston which shows that the average salary of bilingual teachers is about $10,000, whereas for non-bilingual teachers, it is about $18,000. A closer look will reveal that of the approximately 200 teachers in Boston, only a small number are on tenure or are legally licensed.

To satisfy the needs on the competency side of the ledger, consider the following recommendation for competency development offered by the Executive Council of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. (Alonso, M. Peroles, et al, Report of Task Force, commissioned by the Executive Council of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. This report appears in Hispania, 1973):

"In preparing teachers to teach children to participate in a pluralistic society, the traditional system based on a monolingual, monocultural model as it presently exists in many teacher-training institutions does not lend itself to providing equal educational opportunity to all children. For all teachers involved in Bilingual/ Bicultural educational programs, there are certain basic competencies which must be developed. Among these are:

1. A humanistic approach to education that:

   a. develops an attitude in teachers that views all children as capable, worthy, and unique;

   b. helps teachers develop a concept of cultural democracy suited for educating children in a pluralistic society;

   c. fosters an attitude of acceptance and respect for unique cultural and linguistic traits;

   d. concerns itself with the unique motivational incentive learning in relating styles which the culture produces in its members, and attitude that help to develop and enhance self-concept;

2. A specialized competency which will include:

   a. language skills; a control of the target languages in both standard and regional dialects;

   b. second language teaching skills; an ability to teach literacy in the target language in the content areas where a specialized vocabulary is required;

   c. contrastive linguistics and applied linguistics: a knowledge of the nature of language and language learning;

   d. reading development techniques; ability to develop reading skills in one native language as well as in the second language.

3. A knowledge of the cultural heritage that includes sociology, folkways, values, aspirations, and immediate environment of pupils and family;

4. An awareness of differing learning styles and the skills to accommodate them;

5. In addition, the teacher should be able to:

   a. effectively communicate the philosophy and rationale of bilingual education and the needs of non-English-speaking students to other faculty, administrators, parents, and larger communities;

b. deal with intercultural dynamics;

c. maintain a flexible stance in the classroom;

d. assess the needs of students and prescribe individualized instruction.

How are these ideals being executed? And if they are not being met, how might they be fulfilled? I'm sure that many issues will be raised in the days of the conference that will directly and indirectly try to provide responses to these questions.

Although there are several discrete and important issues in the legislative policy, the one I will deal with is that of language and culture competency. The legislation states: "The Board shall grant certificates to teachers of transitional bilingual education who present the Board with satisfactory evidence that they (1) possess a speaking and reading ability in a language other than English, in which bilingual education is offered,and communicative skills in English...." (Massachusetts General Laws, Acts of 1971, Chapter 71A, Transitional Bilingual Education, Section 6) Specific suggestions to implement the charge

> "A school community or an approved teacher preparatory institution, using criteria established with the Board of Education, man determine that an individual possesses a speaking and reading ability in a language other than English, communicative skills in English and an understanding of the history and culture of the country, territory or geographical area whose spoken language is that in which the candidate possesses such speaking and reading ability. A statement to this effect signed by a superintendent of schools or the appropriate administrator of the preparing institution, and approved by the Director of the Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education may be submitted as evidence that an individual meets this requirement. (Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 71A, Acts of 1971, Transitional Bilingual Education, Regulation 14)

The first important piece in the legislation was the authorization given to the State Board of Education to establish criteria to determine the desired teacher competencies. The story of how that was accomplished and the mechanisms utilized to arrive at a reasonable position would be enough to fill another

paper. Suffice it to say that the state administrative unit; namely, the Bilingual Bureau with the counsel of the State Bilingual Advisory Council, proposed the criteria to the Board which were ultimately approved.

Briefly the criteria are as follows:

1. Requirements of Foreign Service Institute Native or Bilingual Proficiency Rating

2. Requirements of Foreign Service Institute Minimum Professional Proficiency in English

3. Requirements of Culture Competency in English and Other Languages (Massachusetts Board of Education, Criteria to Determine Bilingual Teacher Competencies in Language Skills and Culture. Criteria are published in "Two Way," Massachusetts Department of Education, publication 5M-6-74-092173, Page 31)

How are the criteria implemented and what kind of compliance procedures have been established? The approved procedures promulgated by the Board are cited below:

> To insure that school committees and approved teacher preparatory institutions meet the criteria established by the Board of Education, the Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education requires that the following procedures be met:
>
> 1. Establish a Board of Examiners to assist the school committee or the approved teacher preparatory institution in verifying possession of the skills and competencies required by law and the proficiency specified in the criteria. The following guidelines will be observed:
>
>   a. The Board of Examiners will be composed of a minimum of three members.
>
>   1. The first member shall be an educator who possesses language competency and cultural awareness equivalent to the FSI ratings S-4 and R-4 and the MLA rating for cultural awareness adopted by the Board of Education.
>
>   2. A second member shall be an administrator, and,
>
>   3. A third shall be a member of the community of the language being examined. The community member shall be chosen by a committee made up of parents and community representatives of the language being served. Parent Advisory Councils should be utilized to implement this requirement.

b. The Board of Examiners may require written examinations of a formal or informal nature to determine competency in reading and writing.

c. The Board of Examiners shall interview each candidate orally to determine speaking facility, awareness of culture and knowledge of history and customs.

d. Appointment to the Board of Examiners shall be by the local school committee or approved teacher preparatory institution renewable each year.

2. Submit in writing to the Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education a plan stating the methods to be utilized to meet the criteria.

3. The Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education shall:

a. Approve all plans,

b. Reserve the right to participate in an interview and examination process,

c. Approve evidence attesting that an individual meets all the requirements,

d. Submit a statement of approval that an individual meets all the requirements to the Bureau of Teacher Certification and Placement. (Ibid; Pages 33 and 34)

There are a number of trivial problems accompanying the administration of this change, some of which are of the process type. For example, how are documents submitted by an Institute of Higher Education notarized. How does the State Bilingual Unit verify to the Office of Certification the competency of a given individual? How do documents get processed when there are overlapping authorities? What happens if a candidate fails? More important, however, are the content questions: How are the broad criteria of the FSI implemented at the test sites? Who does the testing? What about the credentials of the testers? What about other training in evaluating candidates? How do we test languages? How do we test culture? What instruments are to be used? What about the quality of the evaluation from site to site? How is the process evaluated? The list of questions is large and the problems that go with them are many and varied.

In the initial stages of implementing the Board criteria, two significant problems appeared immediately. The legislation and regulations allowed a school committee through its superintendent of schools to determine the language and culture competency of teachers. Consequently, the evaluation of language and culture skills could take place at the local school district level. On August 24, 1972, the criteria were promulgated, and almost immediately some thirty local school districts established boards of examination to carry out the required procedures. It didn't take long to discover that that process was loaded with potential problems, one of which was the matter of consistency in evaluation.

Another phenomenon was occurring at the same time. The same thirty local school districts were establishing parent advisory councils part of whose function was to participate in the screening process for the hiring of personnel. The latter in most cases was done by establishing screening teams. While it is clear that there were two distinct issues involving teacher competency being treated at the same time, in practice the distinction became clouded, distorted, and almost completely misunderstood. The crux of the problem was the local school district's failure to separate its charge to determine competency for licensing purposes from the requirement to involve parents in the hiring process. It became clear very quickly that there were a host of problems with the procedure including the strong potential for conflicts of interest. After due consideration of the issues, an administrative decision was made to cease to allow local school districts to determine the language and culture competencies of bilingual teachers for purposes of meeting the state licensing requirement.

Since the regulations permit teacher preparatory institutions to carry out the Board's criteria, one public institution of higher education in the Boston area was granted approval to serve as a testing site. The experience of the

latter proved to be satisfactory in meeting the board requirements, consequently, it was decided to expand this mechanism by inviting other Institutes of Higher Education to serve as evaluation centers. The expansion has occurred, sometimes cautiously and diligently, but in all cases with a commitment to serve the needs of the community at large.

In spite of the care and deliberation taken to ensure uniform implementation of the criteria, a second significant problem to which I alluded earlier began to occur. As more campus testing sites were established, it became evident that interpretation of the broad Board guidelines varied from site to sete and, consequently, so did procedures such as methods of testing, types of tests, emphasis of the evaluations and other related matters.

THE ILLINOIS EXPERIENCE

H. Ned Seelye

Illinois provides bilingual education in about 20 languages, 80% of the enrollment is Spanish, composed of Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Cubans, and a representative sample of the rest of the Spanish-speaking world.

This multi-language, multi-ethnic mix facilitates our not falling frequently into the ethnocentricities that occur when we speak from one ethnic background, while attempting to communicate with children of various backgrounds.

Teacher selection has included requirements of fluency in the language and residence of two or more years in a country that speaks the relevant language (or having been raised in a home that speaks that language). We didn't give any tests. We asked that our school officials refer questions to a local advisory council, the majority of whom are parents of children enrolled in the bilingual program. Then we sent our monitors out to corroborate the schools. The monitors would go into a classroom and start talking in Spanish. They might say, "Que tal" and the teacher might respond, "Son las diez y media," or not say anything at all. We would then withhold reimbursement from the school for the cost of the teacher. In cases where the teacher had not been raised in a Spanish speaking bilingual home, or had not lived two or more years in a Spanish speaking country we referred the case to the local advisory council. We would obtain their recommendation in writing, as well as the principal's, and then make our own decision as to whether or not we would grant them a probationary "stay of execution." We found teachers not meeting minimum criteria mostly in relatively undesirable school situations; in very isolated communities that had little sophistication in dealing with the needs of culturally different children. Since there was a shortage of bilingual teachers, we would grant a discretionary stay of execution, and pressure the teacher into spending the next

summer in Mexico or Puerto Rico. We had quite a bit of success and the effectiveness of these marginal cases increased over the course of a few years. Ethnically speaking, about 90% of the Chicago teachers in Spanish programs are currently from a Latino background, about 50% of the teachers in the state are from a Latino background, the other 50% are Anglo, all of whom, with a few exceptions, have lived two or more years in a Latin-American country.

When the law was passed mandating bilingual education about 3 years ago, the certification section somewhat undermined our ability to look at languages in this type of cultural context. The law that was mandated required fluencey in Spanish (to use an example), and communicative competence in English. Before making a decision of what level of fluency we wanted, we wook a random sample of bilingual teachers who were teaching, to find out what their language abilities were. We examined them in both English and Spanish using the Foreign Service Institute criteria of 0 to 5, 5 being equivalent to an educated native speaking ability. We found, to our dismay, that they ranged all the way from 2 to 5 in both languages. It was clear that if we were to limit teacher certification to teachers who were bilingual with scores of 4 or 5 in the foreign service type examination in both languages, then we weren't going to have many teachers at all. So we decided that communicative competence in English meant that they could just function rudimentarily in the school building.

We identified communicative competence in English as a 2 on the FSI examination. We would require native or near-native fluency in English for those who would teach English as a second language. We feel that if a teacher is going to spend all of his/her classroom day teaching math in Spanish, he/she doesn't have to know a great deal of English. For Spanish fluency we defined the minimum cut-off as 4. This is the highest level we thought we could require. We have Chicano teachers who do not do too well on written examinations. We have Anglo

teachers who do pretty well on written examinations, but can't communicate effectively because they have never experienced the social context within which communication occurs; they have disassociated Latin-American culture from Spanish and consequently are miscommunicating all the time.

The minimum fluency required is to a certain extent a function of supply and demand. If you need 2,000 teachers to communicate with kids in their own language, and you have 500 that meet your requirements, then you have to seriously ask yourself whether certification is to keep teachers out or to get needed teachers in. It seems to me that the purpose of certifying people for bilingual education, at this stage of the game, is to get someone in the classroom who can communicate with the students, not to keep such a person out of the classroom. One of the biggest surprises for traditional educators was to entertain the hypothesis that the typical school graduate who may have had only the equivalent of a high school education in Latin America, but who had taught successfully in a rural school in Latin America, would enter a Chicago city school and teach effectively. Any person who holds a teaching certificate from another country, even though that generally means the equivalent of a high school education as we define it, is eligible for a bilingual certificate. That was a difficult policy for Certification to accept.

We found many penalties in having a law mandating bilingual education (e.g., fanatics and bigots seem to emerge from the woodwork). We experienced a great deal of negativism that was not apparent before. One of the very positive things we found about having a bilingual program mandated is that lethargic state agencies and large city school systems begin to slowly respond to a mandate, where they previously showed very little concern in responding to the needs of students.

I want to relate one anecdote. I spent December in the upper Amazon jungle of South America, in eastern Ecuador. I was evaluating bilingual programs that were in little jungle hamlets where you generally get about 25 families living in thatched huts, a distance away from the comforts of life. For instance, one typical little village that I visited was an 11-day ride by dug-out canoe from the nearest town with electricity. The natives used curare tipped darts to kill monkeys, parrots, and wild boar for food. They hunted and fished and were just beginning to develop agriculture. Some of these villages decided for various reasons that they needed to have a school program. A school program in that kind of setting can mean one of three things: It can mean that you teach children in the Spanish language (which none of them know), and, therefore, the children do not understand anything that is taught (that's the option most popular in the United States). The second option is to teach them in a monolingual program in a language they do understand (Cofan, Secoya, Jibaro, etc.). The third option is to provide a bilingual program where the bulk of instruction occurs in a language they do understand but where they also develop, in the course of time, some fluency in Spanish. The villages that I visited had opted for the third choice, namely, to have a bilingual program. They had a precedent for not having too much faith in anyone the government had sent in from the capital to teach them. They insisted that the only terms under which they would have bilingual education would be if someone from their own village taught the program. Usually, no one in their own village had ever spent a day in a classroom, even as a student. Therefore, the villagers selected whomever they thought would make a good teacher. The teacher then went through a ten week intensive training program in the jungle. For seven weeks, morning, afternoon, and evening, the teachers were taught the concepts of the first third of first grade. For the remaining three weeks of the training session they were taught how to teach those concepts. Then they returned to their jungle villages and for a year they taught the first third of

first grade. The second year they came back and got the second third of first grade. I talked to teachers who had done this a dozen years before, and I would be willing to have any one of my children attend their classes for extended periods of time, and I would be confident that they were getting a good education. The teachers can educate, and they were using individualized instruction, flannel boards, and chalkboards effectively. They were also concerned about restless students, and about community involvement. If those teachers can do it, I am sure that someone who loves kids and is interested in education can also do it. Therefore, I am not overly concerned about how many people are permitted to enter through lenient certification requirements.

One of the major weaknesses we have in Illinois is that there has not been, to date, sufficient seed money to help universities respond to bilingual teacher education. We do have a dozen universities doing "something." Much of what they are doing consists of the Education Department fighting with the Spanish Department to determine in whose domain the bilingual program will be found. Bilingual education and special education are two of the few areas where teachers are currently being hired. Therefore, the general attitude is that it is a way to save the faculties of the colleges of Education and Spanish from extinction. Let's get these wonderful folks who gave your education in the past another chance now to turn out bilingual teachers.

In addition to being concerned about the qualifications we are going to require of teachers to work in bilingual programs, we also worry about the qualifications of teachers who train teachers. These university personnel sometimes lack cultural sensitivity. We have not found any correlation of ethnicity with ethnic sensitivity. We have had Puerto Rican exchange teachers whom we have had to send back to Puerto Rico because they didn't want to teach Puerto Rican children in Chicago. We have had Mexican teachers whom we have had to send back because they were apalled at little kids' saying things like,

"nadie aqui me quiere," which was probably true. We have not been able to ethnically identify the culprit of cultural insensitivity.

We have developed what has become an extensive evaluation program to train people who do not know a great deal about bilingual education, but who are interested in it. We find many of university "experts" talking about bilingual education who know nothing about the area. Do you suppose anybody is listening to them? We try to involve them in an intensive, in-service training program. The problem is in telling a university teacher, who is in charge of turning out bilingual teachers that he/she doesn't know anything about what he/she is doing. We can't do that! However, we have found a diplomatic way of doing it. We propose the organization of an on-site evaluation of bilingual programs, structure it; point their noses to all of the things you want them to see, ask the questions that you want them to ask, and send somebody in to head the team who really does know something about bilingual education. So, we have university teachers who don't know anything, parents who know something, community people, regular school personnel, and school administrators, forming teams with representatives from each group. We developed a whole booklet that they can go though line by line to work themselves through this evaluation.

This year we had 500 people involved in visitations to 70 schools for two days. We began to broaden the expertise of bilingual education that way. There are a lot of things we would like to bring to their attention but have not found a way to do it. One solution has already been mentioned. Anybody who talks about bilingual education, and is ignorant of its involvement in the political arena, is missing the boat. Most education is political and educational decisions are made within a political arena. These aren't just Democratic and Republican

political arenas, it's community concern, vested interest groups, lobbyists, pressure groups ,and others, all occurring with the political arena. The school itself is a microcosmic political arena. Often our bilingual teachers come into a school in their first year of teaching ,and they don't know how to get anything done because they have not been given the skills. Nobody ever talked about how to get materials or supplies from the principal, or how to "butter up" the secretary to get the supplies you need. They haven't decoded the system yet. They might have achieved this in undergraduate college but they haven't done so in the public school.

One common pre-service model to train bilingual teachers has the university telling candidates that they have just the courses for them. They have this course in anthropology, this course in sociology, and this one in Spanish. Consequently, the student takes courses from teachers who have never talked to each other before, who have never been in a bilingual classroom, and who know nothing about bilingual education. Somehow the university system thinks that the student is going to have the genius to integrate and synthesize things that he is getting from here, there, and everywhere when the university can't even determine a structural way to synthesize the courses.

We now have language proficiency testing being done by the universities. This is one way to dramatize that in addition to their bilingual courses, students are going to have to meet a certain level of language proficiency in English and Spanish to get a job. I am disappointed that this is the only structural device that we are using to increase the quality of bilingual training programs.

Bilingual education is not language instruction. It is not even principally concerned with language. It is concerned with everything you are concerned with when you educate a child ,and it is done through the medium of a language.

It wouldn't bother me at all if they threw out Spanish as a continuing language and English as a second language. I think that you learn language because you want to do something else. You learn to talk persuasively because you want to develop a relationship with a girl, not because you want to use the pluperfect subjunctive . I think language is just one of those mechanisms that is used to respond to basic physical and psychological needs.

In pre-service bilingual training, Illinois offers everything from a bachelor's degree to a doctorate degree. Some of the programs are better than others, and some have staff who know what they are doing. But, none of them is in a school setting. There does not seem to be an integrated program which has the structure as well as a knowledgeable staff.

We held meetings with university faculty at the early stages when bilingual education was just getting started. However, since we were pressed for time, we drew up priorities and decided that they were probably trainable, perhaps even educable, but we were going to have to work with them only when we had time. Instead, we put our time and effort into developing bilingual programs with children in schools.

A few years ago (this would no longer be true in our state) 60 bilingual teachers attended an in-service conference and I was inspired to ask whether they had taught for two or more years. Six hands were raised. What we had, in short, was an inexperienced group of teachers. Though it was not clear to them, it was clear to everyone else that the teachers did not have all the skills necessary to do the job that they were supposed to be doing. They often didn't even have the language skills. They were simply assigned to a class. They often did not know the terms for sets or fractions in Spanish, even though they might have come from Spanish-speaking homes. As we all know, bilinguality is a matter of commanding different domains, and not a case of having equal bilinguality in all domains. Not only did they not know the language,but they did not know the

concepts they were supposed to teach in their grades. They felt very proud of themselves because they had the language and cultural skills necessary to (potentially) communicate with the children they taught, and the other prople in the system did not.

Attempts to get them to upgrade their skills by taking graduate work met with a lack of interest. It wasn't until we began to offer scholarships to Mexico for intensive graduate work with all expenses paid that we got the bilingual teachers to up-grade their skills. At first, we started on the locally oriented scene by giving conferences. We probably became the country's greatest experts at organizing conferences. Conferences are one kind of a learning environment, but after a while you exhaust the potential of conferences. We then organized regional workshops, where participants were expected to do work. We became very sophisticated at developing workshops, and could run fifteen different topics concurrently, in six different regions simultaneously. We granted college credit, and conducted smaller kinds of workshops. It worked out beautifully at first. Participants began to get college credits. Aides began to see bilingual education as a career ladder program, and bilingual teachers began to see themselves advancing.

This year we are running into problems once again. Bilingual teachers are no longer captivated by these courses and there are many different kinds of courses being offered. They are not captivated by these courses because they are re-learning what we all know, namely, that it's difficult to adapt the knowledge acquired in an academic setting to a practical situation. What teachers want are people to go with them and work with them in their classroom setting. We are trying to figure ways to do that, but it's difficult because it is hard to make an impact with a small staff. We are trying to determine how to get universities involved in the classroom setting. Generally, what happens is that the university will go into the school, but not into the classroom.

They'll go into an empty room, and then the teachers from the building will come and fill up the seats. That's the same as running a classroom!

WORKSHOP SUMMARIES

BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION

John Borel
Gil Sánchez

The workshop on Bilingual Certification began with introductory remarks by Dr. Arturo Gutierrez, who discussed bilingual teacher training in Texas. He stated that in spite of the fact that 1,600 teachers have completed training programs this past year, there is still a shortage of some 4,000 bilingual teachers in the state. Texas has a structure set up for bilingual certification and a great deal of support for it, unlike the situation in New York State, where there is no bilingual certification and a great deal of opposition on the part of teacher unions and several lobbying groups.

Dr. Gutierrez pointed out the lack of tenure laws in Texas which is a major issue in considering bilingual certification in New York State. If a teacher in New York State were placed in a "bilingual tenure track," rather than in an elementary or secondary track, there could be problems with making a change if bilingual programs were discontinued in a given district. Since many programs in New York State depend on federal funds, the job security inherent to other teaching positions would be non-existent for bilingual teachers. When bilingual education becomes mandated in New York, it is likely that certification procedures for bilingual teachers will be established. The state and local governments in Texas are committed to bilingual education and to the certification of qualified personnel for bilingual programs. Districts must demonstrate their commitment by the continuous training of present and prospective staff, or they will not receive funds.

The New York State Division of Teacher Education and Certification has worked closely with the Bilingual Education Unit in developing a State Plan for

Bilingual Education. They have conducted meetings of higher education personnel around the State, have disseminated information, and this year are requesting a Title VII grant to undertake comprehensive leadership training of higher education and school district personnel.

New York does not presently have a bilingual certificate, but a number of meetings were held to discuss this question over the past year. At the last meeting, a proposal was made to the Regents Advisory Board on Teacher Education, Certification and Practice, by members of the Commissioner's Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, that the State establish such a certificate. The question is being considered, but there has been some delay due to recent Department reorganization and budget cuts.

"ESL IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION"

Mary Hines
Richard L. Light

Following a general discussion of the role of ESL in Bilingual Education, the following points appeared to emerge as group consensus:

1. There was agreement that the Position Paper on the Role of ESL in Bilingual Education was unexceptional. It was seen as an excellent statement concerning the compatibility, and at the same time, the distinctiveness, of the fields of ESL and bilingual education.
2. There was concern voiced that (to the best of our knowledge) there is no specialist with expertise, experience, and formal training primarily in English as a second language at the State Education Department for the elementary and secondary school levels. It was noted that this situation clearly violates the intent of the Position Paper mentioned above. In order to fulfill the intent of the Position Paper and properly serve the 300,000 non-English background students in New York State, it was strongly suggested that such a person be appointed.
3. There was discussion of the progress of the Task Force on TESL Certification sponsored by the New York State ESOL and Bilingual Educators' Association. It was agreed that this effort, as well as the bilingual certification effort, should be strongly supported by ESL and bilingual educators throughout the state.
4. There was a brief discussion of the resolutions on teacher certification and on competency-based teacher education passed recently at the national TESOL Convention in New York City. There was general

agreement that these statements represented a good lever for assisting in obtaining certification for both ESL and bilingual education. (Copies of these resolutions are reprinted in the Appendix.)

5. There was some discussion of the Community Language Learning format of Curran and LaForge as it relates to ESL. Mary Hines discussed her experience in two CLL institutes. She noted that such an approach appeared to hold both promises and paradoxes for more effective English as a second language teaching/learning.

THE ROLE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND ETHNIC STUDIES IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Edna Acosta-Belen
Charles R. Hancock

Perspective is difficult to achieve during times of rapid change. The roles of various aspects of the educational process with respect to each other, and to bilingual education, in particular, are dynamic.

Throughout this session of the conference, it was apparent that the perspectives issue was at play. A fundamental point which was made at the outset is that the title should read Roles, rather than Role, of Foreign Languages and Ethnic Studies in Bilingual Education. This distinction was reflected during the discussion. Three basic roles were identified. They are:

1) Support
2) Interaction
3) Research

These were discussed by various members of the group who were able to suggest the ways in which Foreign Languages and Ethnic Studies have collaborated with Bilingual Education Programs at their institutions. It was concluded that the merits of establishing solidarity through these kinds of interaction is essential because all of these programs must continue to seek ways of becoming integral parts of the educational system. The dangers of remaining an appendage were also described, with elimination being the most negative and undesirable result.

The three areas are interwoven and clearly reinforce each other. Support can, of course, take many forms. It was felt that the most effective types of support might be those which seek to influence members of the power structure.

Sometimes overt confrontation is not the most expeditious means of achieving a goal. Working in concert, however, as a unified trilogy (Bilingual Education/ Foreign Languages/Ethnic Studies) in a systematic and mutually supportive warp was thought to be highly desirable.

Offering courses which meet the needs of students in all three programs was one method of interaction which received extensive discussion. The various efforts along these lines at SUNY-Albany were described (i.e. courses such as The Puerto Rican Child in U.S. Schools, Foreign Languages as a Discipline, Puerto Rican Culture, etc.). Another approach to interaction which was discussed is that of counseling. A program at Adelphi was described as a personalized approach to counseling and meeting the needs of Hispanic undergraduates who are enrolled in a Bilingual Education Program. A representative of that school described the objective as getting the undergraduates to think . "He indicated that they end up talking about "Bilingual Education, social mobility -- the whole thing, in terms of examining our position in society, the Puerto Rican child, the school, the crime, and the social institutions; that is, the educational institutions whereby our American Society has used schools as the immediate means of social change." This section of the discussion was very lively with input from most participants.

Throughout the discussions there were references to several newsprint posters which had been set up prior to the session. These posters described the helping and hindering forces for interaction between Foreign Languages, Ethnic Studies, and Bilingual Education. The contents of these posters are described below, but participants were encouraged to apply these "forces" to their own local situations because the degree to which any of them is influential depends upon local conditions. Again, examples from the various institutions represented by the participants were shared during this discussion.

A. Helping Forces included

1. Mutual Concerns (goals)
2. Strength in Numbers (solidarity)
3. Interdisciplinary Nature of the Three Areas
4. Personalities of Staff Members (This may be both a helping and a hindering force.)
5. Foreign Languages and/or Ethnic Studies may already be established as a program within the organization (system); Bilingual Education seeks ultimately to be an integral part of the system. (This is an assumption.)

B. Hindering Forces included:

1. Ideological/Political Differences
2. Job Competition
3. Personalities of Staff Members (This may be both a helping and a hindering force.)
4. Structural Limitations (within a given institution)

The interaction among discussion leaders and participants was lively, and included many detailed examples which this summary of the proceedings does not include. Ending on a very positive note, this session was highly praised by participants who encouraged the scheduling of such a session next year.

The first part of this workshop was dedicated to discussing the ways in which the academic areas of Foreign Language, Ethnic Studies and Bilingual Education can provide expertise and knowledge to one another, in order to create a situation of interdisciplinary cooperation that at the same time supplements and compliments each separate field.

I would like to dedicate the rest of the time today to present an issue which should be of utmost importance to language educators, especially to those of us involved with the education of minority groups--I'm referring to the issue of language and social attitudes. My comments are basically a product of my experience working with Puerto Ricans and other Hispanic background students in the United States in language classes, and the frustrations that they have undergone when they entered regular Spanish language courses and were confronted with the academic snobbery and language prejudices of instructors who failed to understand the nature and character of language in society.

In society we have developed many attitudes towards language as it is spoken by individuals or groups. There is obviously a language norm which often has been described as the "standard language," or as the "ideal" or "correct" way of speaking a language. This norm is much too often talked about and almost never defined or described by those who try to use it in order to make value judgements about the language spoken by different groups or nationalities. This norm has been named by the Norwegian-American linguist, Einar Haugen, as "the rhetorical norm," which describes the language used by writers in literature, and spoken by almost no one.

If we agree that the most important aspect of language is communication, we must also understand that different groups and classes within a given society have a common language, but the way in which that language is utilized by each group or class varies according to many variables (i.e., level of

education, etc.). Therefore, the ways in which speakers use a common language to communicate (which has been identified by Haugen as the "communicative norm") provide us with a wide spectrum of possibilities. Joseph Stalin, in his essay, "Marxism and Linguistics", describes this aspect of language:

> People, the individual social groups, the classes, are far from indifferent to language. They strive to utilize the language in their own interests, to impose their own interests, to impose their own special vocabulary, special terms, and special expressions upon it. The upper strata of the propertied classes, who are divorced from and detest the people--the aristocratic nobility, the upper strata of the bourgeoisie--particularly distinguish themselves in this respect. 'Class' dialects, jargons drawing-room 'languages' are created. These dialects and jargons are often incorrectly referred to in literature as the 'aristocratic language' or 'bourgeois language,' in contradiction to 'proletarian language' or 'peasant language'.
>
> Dialects and jargons are therefore offshoots of the common national language, possessing no linguistic independence of any kind and doomed to stagnation.

I have chosen to quote these paragraphs because they touch upon some of the major points that I would like to share with you today.

The main purpose of this presentation today is to destroy the myth of "language purity" which has led many educators in language programs to teach language in terms of <u>superiority</u> or <u>inferiority</u>, and to evaluate speakers of a given language in these terms. This practice has resulted in the downgrading of people, and in unjust discrimination against many groups, and has had a serious impact on the self-concept of many individuals. Many educators and intellectuals have fallen into the futile and misguided effort to maintain the "rhetorical norm" in an attempt to preserve what they call "language purity." This effort, however, has often resulted in inflexible and prejudicial attitudes towards those groups who use a different dialect of a given language or use contact dialects such as "Yiddish" or "Spanglish ." They have concluded that these contact dialects are a result of laziness, ignorance or scorn toward the mother

tongue. These attitudes reflect a failure to understand the natural process of language variations, and the fact that language is a flexible and dynamic system which responds to changes and situations within a society.

In my article "Spanglish: A Case of Languages in Contact," I specifically described the process of language contact as it pertains to the Hispanic community in the United States. The process which brings about such phenomena has been shown to be a natural one undergone by any and all groups in a situation in which a majority language (English) is in contact with a minority language (Spanish).

Many studies have shown that the lexical aspect of the language is usually the most subjected to change in society. The vocabulary itself, however, does not constitute a language, although no language can exist without it. It is the grammer (morphology and syntax) or the rules governing the words into sentences which gives language its intelligible character. History has shown us that changes in the grammatical structure of a given language are very slow and the results are evident only after centuries.

For a speaker of Spanish in American society, there are two major things that he/she will have to confront:

1. Even if the speaker is a native speaker of the language, his/her language is often evaluated using the so-called Castillian Spanish as the norm. Any person coming from areas in Latin America and the Caribbean, therefore, is evaluated according to this norm. Sometimes, reference is made to a theoretically uniform Latin American Spanish, which is equally false.
2. There is also a second generation of hispanics in the U.S. who constitute the offspring of immigrants who came to this country. The Spanish they learn is the Spanish spoken in the community, and it contains, therefore, words that have been borrowed or adapted phonetically from the majority language (English) to the minority language. The result of this is a situation of

language contact reflected through the incorporation of new words adapted from the English into the Spanish and, in addition, through the switching from one language to another.

It follows from this presentation that certain educational considerations must be made in bilingual education programs in reference to the language that the child brings to the classroom from the community. If the major objective of bilingual education is to start "where the child is" and to make the child feel free to express himself/herself in the language he/she is familiar with, an understanding of the nature of language, its class character and the existence of dialects is essential for teachers and educators in general.

IMPROVING LITERACY SKILLS IN TWO LANGUAGES

Edgar Rodríguez
Gloria Zuazua

The workshop began by recognizing that many students in Bilingual Education programs have difficulty in both English and/or Spanish. Participants were invited to discuss problems they are facing regarding English and Spanish literacy skills among their students, and to share the ways in which they have attempted to solve them. The problematic situations described were the varying degrees of language skills, attitudes towards the languages, and the existing divisions between education departments and Spanish departments.

Student Assessment

Much attention was given to the problems of assessing students' needs. Students' language skills must be determined in order to make provi ions for growth and development. The sparcity of adequate diagnostic instruments makes English and Spanish language assessment difficult at the present time.

Another concern is the grouping of students for instructional purposes where thereare often noticeable differences in communication skills. Some will have good oral skills but are weak in reading and writing while others have the reverse problem.

In addition to the improvement of English and Spanish skills, there are also individual students' needs which must be met. Included in this group are the needs of persons working in special service areas such as nursing, or social services. For example, vocabulary needed in these areas would not be found in a first year Spanish grammar book.

Language Courses

In many cases it is not mandatory for students to enroll in a language skills course. The schools which do mandate that the students take a course

in English or Spanish skills are not always able to offer programs which are relevant to the students' needs. It is even more difficult to provide relevant courses when some students see their Spanish as a dialect and prefer to be taught according to the standards in Spain, while others feel that "Standard Spanish" is not a communication link with their community, and prefer to be taught a dialect. Other existing problems within language courses are the negative attitudes of some professors towards the English and/or the Spanish spoken by their students as well as a lack of appropriate materials to assist the professor teaching Spanish and English skills to various groups of students. Moreover, with regard to university courses, the language skill level is sometimes too advanced because of the training of the professors; high school teachers may be able to meet the present students' needs more readily.

Aside from specific course problems, universities must also deal with divisions which exist between departments which hinder the success of programs. Cooperation would increase the opportunity to achieve the goals of bilingual education. An example of this, is the division that exists between the Spanish department and the Education department in many universities. Bilingual education is not integrated into the total curriculum of the university. For example, a student may be studying for a degree in bilingual education theory in three out of five semester courses. Better coordination of efforts is needed, not only on the departmental level, but on the total university level as well.

The following is a point-by-point listing of the problems that were discussion and their possible solutions:

PROBLEMS	RECOMMENDATIONS
1. College language courses are not mandated throughout sequence.	1. Guidelines on Bilingual Education should require sequential English and Spanish language courses throughout the Bilingual program.
2. Individual differences and needs exist within groups needing remediation.	2. Language programs have to be individualized.
3. There is a lack of appropriate materials to teach Spanish and English to different groups.	3. Curriculum materials from the Department of Instruction in Puerto Rico can be modified for instructional purposes in the teaching of Spanish.
4. A division exists between the Spanish Department and the Education Department in most universities. Bilingual education is not integrated into the total university curriculum.	4. An integrated approach is essential in Bilingual Education a) Target population and people involved in teaching b) Language and methodology c) Language and all other university subjects. Bilingual Education must permeate all related areas in an integrative process.
5. Schools which have English and Spanish programs do not have relevant ones which meet students' needs.	5. Instead of a traditional language lab, a "Communicative Activities" program can be set up on a daily basis. This approach utilizes basic, everyday conversation, and written materials are not needed.

6. Assessment of language skills is difficult, and available tests for diagnosing skills are inadequate.	6. More research is needed in this area.
7. There is a need for better coordination of efforts between schools in the United States and schools in Spanish-speaking communities.	7. More exchange programs between Spanish speaking countries and schools in the United States should be initiated.
8. Programs of specialized Spanish are necessary for people working in special services in the New York area.	8. Devise a special curriculum to teach Spanish to people in special services.
9. Many language teachers have a negative attitude towards the English and/or Spanish of their students.	9. Retrain university language teachers to utilize methodology appropriate for incoming student population.
10. Many students have a negative attitude towards their Spanish; e.g., they consider it a dialect and would prefer to be taught Spanish according to standards in Spain.	10. Language courses should include phonics, contrastive linguistics, etc. Make the student aware of his language pattern as well as the standard pattern as identified by his university. Stress affective domain in language learning attitudes and values; do not separate the affective domain from the cognitive domain. Students should be aware that both are acceptable means of communication. They should be familiar with both and realize that present teaching requires proficiency in a standard Spanish.

11. Often university personnel are trained to teach in a highly technical manner.

11. High school teachers might be able to meet present students' needs more adequately.

Committees should be formed to address themselves to all of these problems, and should review some of the recommendations.

LOBBYING

Lee Wolfe

The purpose of this workshop was to give an overview of the objectives and procedures for lobbying. A description of two particular types of lobbyist, and how each is perceived by people, was given.

The first is viewed as a person who has a bribe in his/her pocket, and who attempts to seduce politicians. (This is the negative view) The other is viewed as a professional who is extremely well-informed and is a qualified representative of a firm, group or other interest. This person is the best that the group has to offer. (This is the positive view)

Whether functioning as an independent lobbyist, or as a group lobbyist, the prime objective is to obtain support for an issue. Some of the responsibilities included in lobbying are:

1. Identifying a problem,
2. Researching background to find the rationale and scope of the problem, and
3. Identifying support for an idea - what needs to be done and where other support exists.

The importance of having contact with staff members of the Legislature was emphasized, since they usually deal more directly with issues, and actually present them to senators, assemblymen, and other officials. If the staff members support a lobby group, the chances are greater of its being supported by the leaders.

A permit must be obtained in order to lobby. It is possible to set up a hearing for the ventilation of an idea. The purpose of the hearing is not necessarily to obtain a solution, but merely to present issues and give testimony. Written testimony can be requested for the record.

There are a series of "don'ts" which a lobbyist should always have in mind when presenting the issues:

1. Don't concentrate lobbying activities only to your supporters. (Do lobby with the opposition as well.)
2. Don't fail to follow the political advice of legislators.
3. Don't fail to persevere.
4. Don't be unwilling to compromise for success.

The remainder of the workshop was dedicated to a clarification of specific questions about issues presently on the floor in the legislature, such as: bilingual legislation, Hostos Community College, and the City University of New York.

ASSESSING COMPETENCIES IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Migdalia Romero de Ortiz
Lourdes Travieso

The following is an outline of topics covered through informal discussion. Participants shared some of their experiences relating to assessment.

I. State of the Art
   A. University effort
   B. State-wide committee status
   C. Organizational efforts
      1. Center for Applied Linguistics
      2. State

II. Needs: Points to be considered in the assessment and development of appropriate measures.
   A. Levels of Assessment
      1. Assessment of prerequisite skills and knowledges
      2. Pre-assessment of knowledges and experiences
      3. Teacher's assessment of consequences (children)
      4. Post-assessment of teacher's knowledge and skills in isolation, application and performance.
   B. Forms and Types of Assessment: Alternative modes:
      1. Paper-pencil tests
      2. Small group assignments in lab setting, i.e., classroom
      3. Simulations by students in lab setting
      4. Field-based assignments
      5. Self-evaluation with pre-determined criteria
      6. Taping lessons

7. Performance checklists (guidelines)

   a. observational

   b. self check

8. Observations

9. Interaction analysis - observational

C. Materials:

1. Tape recorder

2. Video tape

D. Assessors:

1. student

2. cooperating teacher

3. children's responses

4. college based personnel

5. colleagues

Recommendations from the Assessment Workshop follow.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

1. Distribute a mailing list of persons, including the affiliation and expertise areas of Assessment Workshop participants
2. Distribute to all Assessment Workshop participants the following:
   a. List of competencies compiled and/or developed at state meeting from different state universities and colleges.
   b. Assessment measures developed by individual universities.
   c. Course outlines from different universities, of courses within their bilingual sequence.
3. Inform participants concerning the progress of Edgar Rodriguez's (SUNY at New Paltz) proposal for assessment of competencies.
4. Contact John Borel to obtain information regarding competencies found in the proposals submitted to the State Department of Education.
5. Organize meetings to facilitate the exchange of information regarding Bilingual Education programs at the IHE level. The primary purpose of the exchange is to provide articulation between graduate and undergraduate faculty in order to provide a sequential program without duplication of content.

   Suggestion: The mailing should include a questionnaire in which participants can indicate their specialization in order to share their expertise. For example:

   1) Language Arts Teaching (Spanish and English)
      a) Spanish only
      b) English only
   2) Contrastive Analysis of English and Spanish

3) Theory and Practice of Bilingual Education Programs

4) Culture in the Curriculum

5) Teaching the Content Areas in Bilingual Programs

RESEARCH NEEDS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Marietta Saravia Shore

After reviewing, thinking about, and discussing research needs in bilingual education with some of my colleagues, I find that I have more questions than definite directions. This is one of the exciting challenges of being part of the relatively new field of bilingual education in the public schools of the United States, where the parameters of the field have not yet been rigidly established.

The following are some of the questions I would like to raise for your consideration:

What are some of the goals of research?

1. Is research being performed to provide alternatives and data for policy makers, and to inform decision making and implementation? [12]
2. Is research being performed to provide alternatives and data for administrators, classroom teachers, teacher trainers, parents, and the general public concerning the implications and consequences of various instructional programs in bilingual education?

What are some of the research needs in bilingual education? We need:

1. People whose training and experience includes not only the methodology of research, but also knowledge about the field of bilingual education and its political context.
2. Tools, such as assessment instruments for students in their native language, and process assessment instruments, to monitor program implementation and document the bilingual program model being implemented.

3. A conceptual framework informed by experience and dialogue between those within and outside the communities being "researched." This framework is crucial since it determines the definition and criteria of achievement, goals and objectives, and processes of implementation for student and staff development.
4. Cooperative, interdisciplinary, long-range research programs which include the perspectives of social anthropologists, developmental psychologists, psychological anthropologists, classroom teachers, sociolinguists, parents and students.

In this review, before suggesting specific areas of research, the conceptual framework will be explored. This emphasis stems from a concern that without a comprehensive theoretical framework informed by experienced practioners, the goals and processes in staff development programs for bilingual teachers will be contradictory, and, consequently, the instructional programs for students will flounder.

For example, without a cohesive conceptual framework, the staff development concerned with the methodology of second language learning might include the approach by the Foreign Language Department, that young students be taught the second language through the formal repetition drills of the audiolingual method, and stress discrete sound production by contrastive analysis drills. At the same time, the Sociolinguistics Department might be suggesting an approach that stresses communication and the cognitive-generative learning of the second language, through informal interaction with peers who speak that language. If the staff development program lacks a consistent direction, then the programs for students will suffer, particularly if the attitude toward children with the potential for being bilingual is to

perceive them as in need of "remediation" for "language problems" instead of as language learners.

In Bilingual Children: A Resource Document, Muriel Saville Troike wrote:

> Any further attempts to deal with the problems of the relations between majority institutions and minority groups at the early childhood level must begin with a recognition of the following facts:
>
> a. Teachers and children come with culturally determined individual and group attitudes, expectations and skills.
>
> b. Bilingual children usually have different experiences from the ones assumed or desired by the school.
>
> c. The experiences and academic degrees of teachers are not clearly related to how their students achieve (although their degree of cultural sensitivity seems to be).
>
> d. Teacher attitudes and expectations toward children are based essentially on the children's social class membership.
>
> e. Teacher attitudes and expectations trigger differential responses in themselves to linguistically and culturally diverse children.
>
> f. Children tend to adopt the majority view of them as their own self image, and to live up to either positive or negative expectations.
>
> Overcoming these problems and accepting and using bilingual children's linguistic and cultural experiences as bases on which to build are important goals for early childhood programs, but they will require an understanding of the nature of language and its diversity, how children learn their first and subsequent languages, and the cultural attitudes and practices which affect the children's socialization and cognitive development.
>
> Although concerned primarily with the child from three to five, we cannot isolate him from the whole of his experience. His family, community, and larger society are all prime determinants in his individual identity and his enculturation into that society.[11]

Although I agree with Saville-Troike's analysis, I believe the areas of concern she proposes as solutions are insufficient. How is the political dimension to be taken into account? Saville-Troike points to a crucial

factor in education: teachers'attitudes and expectations based on childrens socioeconomic class and ethnic group membership. This has been supported by the research of several social anthropologists, Lacey (1970), Ogbu (1975), and Rist (1973). How are negative expectations of lower SES children, and the dialectal variations associated with lower SES students, coing to be dealt with in teacher training? Will we look at how the attitudes of teachers and the general public toward Hispanics and other ethnic minority groups are shaped by the communications media, such as newspapers and television, and also by social studies textbooks? For example, will we look at the relationship between the traditional United States political and economic policy toward Latin America, and the media stereotypes of "backward, underdeveloped, dependent"nations? Will we look at the history of Latin America, Spain, and the United States, and learn of the political, military and economic interactions between those nations which transformed autonomous, wealthy, technologically advanced indigenous civilizations such as the Incas, Mayas, Aztecs and Mound Builders into "underdeveloped"nations?

The research of the social anthropologists cited above has suggested that the social structure of schools, within the institution of the public school system, reflects the social structure of the larger society of which it is a part. Within the school, the role of the teacher as an authority figure, the institutions of testing and tracking students, and subsequently teacher expectations and differential behavior toward students (based on their test scores and tracks) all function to maintain the students'original structural position in the dominant society, as determined by the socioeconomic status of their family and ethnic group. This is the case both during the time they are in school and after they graduate or drop out. (Ogbu, 1975)

Ironically, this maintenance of the students' initial socioeconomic status has its parallel in one of the currently held alternative models of bilingual education programs, also called "maintenance." While the goal of this program model (to maintain the student's native language, rather than phase it out) has been more positive, humane and conservative of natural resources than transitional programs, the label "maintenance," does not convey the goal of educational growth or development through the native language.

It has only recently been suggested that there is another possible way of looking at the long range goal of bilingual programs, that is, as developmental bilingual programs. In developmental bilingual programs, the students not only maintain their initial skills of understanding and speaking their native language, but also learn to read in that language, as well as in English, so that the literature of both languages is accessible to them. Students can be educated through both languages throughout their school careers and even college.

We must question what, if any, purpose is served by "transitional" programs which phase out the child's native language in the same educational system which then requires a "foreign language" in high school for academic track students. Perhaps it is simply that educators are not used to perceiving poor, minority group children as having the potential to develop greater skills than the middle class student. It may be disconcerting to an adult who knows only one language that a poor, minority group child may learn to speak and read in two languages.

It is noteworthy that bilingual education has only recently been viewed as a problematic area. Bilingual education is included in the education of European students as a matter of course. One is not considered educated unless he or she is bilingual. In the United States, many elite private schools begin

second language instruction in the early grades. It has only been since bilingual education has been programmed for the poor minority group student in the public schools that it has come to be viewed as "remediation" and "transitional".

Therefore, it would seem to be a must that the political character and function of schools, their hidden agenda, be taken into account in research concerning bilingual education of poor, minority group students in the public schools. What political factors have operated to alter the original goals of Title VII, which included English dominant and monolingual students learning Spanish as a second language while their Spanish dominant classmates learned English as a second language? The present guidelines have shifted from this goal of bilingual education as "enrichment" to bilingual education as "remediation" only for those limited in English. Not only Title VII but also the Lau Decision Guidelines share this "remediation - transitional" framework. How does the teacher's expectation for students who are potentially bilingual differ in each situation? For example, how does the enrichment developmental program compare to the remediation program?

If we pose a frequently cited area of needed research, "Which bilingual instructional models work best for which students?", we can begin to look at the complexity of the problem:

1) Which socioeconomic group?
2) Which age group?
3) Which language-dominance group? For example:
   a) Spanish dominant / limited English
   b) Spanish / English / Bilingual
   c) English dominant / bilingual
   d) English Monolingual

4) Which cultural group?

5) Which instructional model? (There are at least 16 models, see below.)

But most importantly, what does it mean to work best?, and who determines the criteria of achievement and the goals of bilingual programs?

Is the goal to be developmental bilingualism; the maintenance and development of the home language and acquisition and development of the national language? Or, is it to be transition, using the home language as a bridge to the national language?

Is the goal to be assimilation into mainstream American culture or biculturalism or cultural pluralism? Will students have options? What is mainstream American culture? Is it the dominant ideology and mythology of the dominant socio-economic class in the United States?

What does it mean to be "bicultural"?

a) Is being "bicultural" an ability to manipulate two systems but believing in neither?

b) Is being "bicultural" a process of believing in one value system but acting in conformity to another system in certain settings?

c) Is being "bicultural" being able to choose to act in one way in one situation and another way in another situation, similar to situation-appropriate behavior in formal and informal situations in the same culture?

d) Is being "bicultural" having no choice but to act in one way with one value system in one domain, (for example in the business world,) and acting in another way according to a different value system in another domain such as one's home?

e) What is the distinction between cultural pluralism and biculturalism?

f) Would it be useful to acknowledge the conflicts between value systems of a subculture and the dominant culture through activities such as social values clarification?

g) After the students' self concept is enhanced by pride in membership of their ethnic/linguistic/cultural group, how do students learn not to be ethnocentric?

h) How do students learn about differences as well as commonalities we all share by being members of one ecological system?

i) Why, when bilingualism has been part of education for centuries and cultures have changed and new cultures arisen as syntheses of previous cultures in contact, is it suddenly "bicognitive" [9] to know two languages,two codes, two dialects?

j) Is the construct of "cognitive flexibility" useful in dealing with alternative patterns of behaviour and modes of perception, processing and expression?

Why is the field of education so dominated by psychology?

Both elementary and secondary education in the United States are strongly influenced by the field of educational psychology,via teacher training programs and through the determination of the criteria and objectives of educational evaluation. When I studied psychology in graduate school, it was defined as "the science of behavior", the goals of which were behavioral, observable and measurable: "the prediction and control of behavior." That sounds political, doesn't it?

Behaviorism permeates the field of educational psychology and research, and restricts concepts and constructs to operational definitions. While operational definitions are useful in many situations, they can also be limited, and in some situations, even misleading. An example of this can be found in an evaluation of Follow Through which operationally defined the achievement objective for students as "on-task" behavior during the learning period. While "on-task" behavior is observable, and a useful indicator that students may be learning, it is also possible that "off-task" behavior such as not attending, and gazing off in the distance might also be learning, thinking, rehearsing, reformulating or just observing. While on-task behavior may be necessary for working in a factory or bureaucracy, we have to question whether we might not want more from our schools.

Newman and Oliver (cited in Grannis, 1974) noted that the "education industry today thinks of learning and the students themselves, as products of an essentially economic system."[4] This ideology is shared by the majority of evaluators, themselves the product of educational psychology, who perform "product" evaluations; that is, they measure the performance of students either on standardized tests or through the use of "product" objectives. Those who control the criteria or determine the criteria which are used in the assessment of the outcomes of learning exert wide-reaching educational and political control.

Product objectives determine not only program emphases in the content to be learned, but also the ideology of the educational process. If only measurable behavior is deemed important in the system of behavioral objectives, then anything that is not measurable or observable may be ignored. This excludes initiative, feelings, flexibility and divergent thinking, the

application of learning to new situations, and the ability to make effective decisions.

Grannis has suggested that it is "essential to recognize the bias of virtually all developmental psychology in favor of abstraction, the scientist's preferred mode of thought." A blatant example of this bias also appeared in the evaluation of Follow Through in which motivation and self-esteem were categorized as "non-cognitive ."

This not so subtle put down of everything that is not cognitive is so pervasive that even in Krathwohl's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Affective Domain, there is no mention of feelings or expressive behavior. Instead there is "receiving, attending, responding, acceptance and preference for values, conceptualization of values, organization of a value system and characterization by a value."[6] Webster's Dictionary has a somewhat broader definition of the affective domain; it includes emotions and feelings.

This discrepancy between the generally held definition of the affective domain, and the psychologist's delimitation of the affective to the cognitive, may stem from the fact that feelings which may or may not be expressed in behavior are not so easily accessible to the behavioral psychologist. Emotions can only be inferred from behavior and people can choose to disguise their feelings; the behavioral psychologist's interpretation can only be confirmed or corrected if the actor chooses to do so. For example, we are as likely to tap defensive reactions and socially acceptable responses, as any "self-concept" on a "self-concept questionnaire ."

Krathwohl's definition of the affective domain is an example of how operational definitions can both limit and distort concepts and objectives. It is important to look for the areas which are left out of an evaluation,

as well as how constructs are operationally defined, and not limit the objectives of learning only to those aspects which can be measured.

We can also question why elementary and secondary education are so dominated by psychology, with its ideology of individualism, rather than informed by anthropology and sociology, with their perspectives of education as a sociopolitical institution which generally serves the interests of the economically dominant group, by functioning to maintain the status quo. That is, the unequal access to goods, services and pretigious roles of the society as institutionalized in the social structure tends to be maintained. (Ogbu, Rist)

The fields of social and psychological anthropology can also be resources in looking at the interface and conflicts between this formal educational system and the informal education in values and patterns of interaction learned in the process of socialization within families, as well as the informal learning from peers, and from one's religious or other community group.

It is also useful to note the tendency cited by Grannis, "If one values individuation over communality, as pedagogical ideologies typically do, one does not see the mass response (choral repetition) as a learner-learner interaction."[3] The cross cultural perspectives of anthropology allow us to see that some pedagogies value communality over individuation, and enable us to become more aware of the dominant values of our society, as well as the range of values among all the subcultures which make up the United States.

As we have seen that bilingual education involves much more than language learning, it might be well to utilize the perspective of a discipline that includes cross cultural studies of learning, socialization patterns, and inter ethnic group contact and conflict, which looks at schools as an institution within society, functioning to maintain the society as is,

while members of the society may be organizing to adapt to changing conditions. The perspective of social anthropology could, and should, be utilized in research in bilingual education.

Suggested Areas of Research

Rather than rechart ground which has already been charted, I will include here some of the areas of research a group of concerned educators working in the field of bilingual education in 1975 formulated.

Our group, the Center for Applied Research in Bilingual Education (CARIBE) was chaired by Jose Vazquez, Coordinator of Bilingual Programs at Hunter College, and included Carmen Dinos, Assistant Professor at Brooklyn College, David Lopez, Project Director, PRACA, Maria Perez, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor of City University of New York, Marietta Saravia Shore, doctoral candidate, Teachers College, Roberto Soto, doctoral candidate at Harvard University, Gerardo Torres, doctoral candidate at Teachers College, Columbia University, and the late Marta Valle, Executive Director of the Puerto Rican Institute for Social Research. We formulated topics of research in the following areas: 1) Assessment and Evaluation 2) Bilingual Education and Public Policy 3) Linguistics 4) Curriculum.

Research Needs Group

Recommendations

In the discussion, several other factors affecting teacher's low expectations for minority Hispanic students, in addition to low SES, were brought up: racism, sexism and rural origin.

Reinforcing the recommendation that members of the community being researched must have input into the research, Dr. Wolfgang Wolck suggested that questionnaires and instruments which lack this input may include concepts that are not held by the community, and omit others which are.

Indirect assessment of attitudes was suggested by Wolck, such as the double guise model developed by Wallace Lambert to tap attitudes toward different languages and language groups.

Dr. Wolck recommended a book, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, by A. N. Oppenheim, published by Heineman, London. Gloria Zuazua suggested that there should be one topic selected and researched by the group; perhaps self-concept studies of students.

Dr. Clara Rodriguez asked if others had seen the instruments developed by A.I.R. (American Institutes of Research, California), such as the teacher and student questionnaires, which she thought were quite limited. They are being used in a post facto nationwide evaluation of Title VII for the past 5 years. She suggested that the evaluation by AIR be carefully criticized.

Picking up on that suggestion, M. Saravia Shore suggested that perhaps rather than do yet another research study, the group might have more impact if each member could write a short paper which would critique specifically the present methodology, conceptual framework, or practice of research and evaluation concerning bilingual education, with recommendations for alternatives. These papers could be collected by the Bilingual Education Applied Research Unit, Hunter, and MSS would either forward them to Albany for duplication there for each group member, or, if that was not feasible, BEARU would investigate possibilities of duplicating them for each participant.

This was agreed to by those members of the group (attached) who signed a sheet and agreed to forward papers to BEARU, Hunter College, 560 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10022, by July 14. Carmen Perez later agreed to disseminate the papers to all participants.

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Marietta Saravia Shore, Roberto Soto and Jose Vazquez

The following areas will be considered: Instrument Development, Basic Research, Program Evaluation, and Student Assessment.

1. Instrument Development

Identify, review, critique[1] and develop instruments for assessment of student skills, knowledge and affective areas, in Spanish and other native languages.

a) language dominance

b) language proficiency (listening, speaking, reading, writing) in native and second language

c) reading readiness in native and second language

d) diagnostic instruments for the identification of neural and physiological disabilities (visual motor coordination, speech defects) and differential diagnostic instruments; is the problem emotionally or physically based?

e) assessment instruments to identify the intellectually gifted

f) achievement in skill and content areas?
development of objectives-based criterion referenced assessment instruments for achievement in math, science, social studies in L^1

g) assessment of affective areas; self-concept as a learner

h) instruments to assess classroom language use and interaction between teachers and students in the classroom

2. Basic Research

a) Given the development of instruments which distinguish the language dominance of students, conduct research and document findings which show the effects of bilingual programs for different student groups: Spanish dominant, English dominant and English monolingual

b) Given the development of instruments to assess outcomes, which models of bilingual education are most frequent, and which are most effective in terms of cognitive, linguistic and affective development, and for which students?

1. maintenance, transitional or developmental
2. one way or two-way (reciprocal)
3. dual language, free language alternation
4. separate teachers for each language, one bilingual teacher
5. separate content in each language, linguistic summaries, repetition in both
6. student tutoring: cross age, peer tutoring
7. open classroom; open structured classroom; traditionally structured classroom
8. home start, early childhood, elementary, junior high
9. initial reading in vernacular, concurrent reading in both languages
10. ungraded classrooms
11. total bilingual schools as compared to mini-schools within a school
12. schools with bilingual classes as compared to pull-out programs
13. bilingual/bicultural or bilingual cross cultural programs

c) Compare objectives, policies, approaches,

supervision and outcomes:

1. measures of parent involvement
2. teacher involvement
3. teacher satisfaction with program
4. teacher training
5. student growth

d) document the process of institutionalization of a bilingual program as it becomes a part of the structure of the school and school system

e) document the implementation of model bilingual programs (CS 75, JHS 45)

f) anthropological/videotape documentation of student learning styles in the home and classroom

g) documentation of students' learning of other alternative styles in the classroom e.g. Alexenberg's research[1]

3. Evaluation of teacher training

a) Identify and dispel the myths transmitted in teacher training:

"cultural deprivation" of students who are culturally different.

"culturally disadvantaged" students who are economically disadvantaged.

"individual responsibility for achievement"

"equal access to opportunity" in a structurally segmented society.

"genetic inferiority"

The teacher's role as an authority figure

b) Analyze how beginning teachers are socialized into their roles by different agencies: college, on-site workshop, master teachers, field programs, internship program, Unions - UFT

c) Which competencies are necessary for effective teaching? To what end?

4. Program Evaluation (including student assessment)

a) Development of instruments for process evaluation:

1. interview schedules to determine roles and attitudes of participants
2. classroom interaction behavioral checklists
3. classroom process variable checklists to document different models
4. checklists for teacher-intern behavior in the classroom

b) Review the evaluations of bilingual programs in N.Y.C.:

What has been learned from them?

What are their limitations?

How well do they assess the program objectives? How comprehensive are they?

Is the process of implementation by teachers and administrators documented?

c) Develop guidelines for program and student evaluation.

d) Develop manual for teachers on the uses and abuses of program evaluation and assessment of students.

e) Evaluation of process of teacher training at college level BA and MA; on-site; internship

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON ASSESSMENT FOR BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

1.0 CRITIQUES OF TESTS:

1.1 "Bilingual Testing and Assessment"; BABEL; Report containing the proceedings of the 1972 BABEL Workshop and the preliminary findings of the Multilingual Assessment Program in Stockton, California; Available for $1.00 from:

BABEL
Room 13
1414 Walnut Street
Berkeley, California 94709

1.2 Test critiques from the Multilingual Assessment Project in Stockton, California; Available from:

Multilingual Assessment Project
Stockton Unified School District
701 North Madison Street
Stockton, California 95202
Attn: Mr. James Shannon

1.3 Test critiques from the Multilingual Assessment Program in Brentwood, New York; With particular emphasis on the cultural biases of tests; Available from:

Ms. Nicky Nin, Director
Multilingual Assessment Program
78 Wicks Road
Brentwood, New York 11717

1.4 Test evaluations from the Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE) at UCLA; Three volumes containing evaluations of published and unpublished tests, prepared for use by Project Directors to guide their selection of assessment instruments; Included are primarily English and nonverbal assessment instruments; Each test is evaluated in four areas: Measurement Validity, Examinee Appropriateness, Administrative Usability, and Normed Technical Excellence, Available from?

Center for the Study of Evaluation
145 Moore Hall
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

CSE-ECRC Preschool/Kindergarten Test Evaluations; R. Hoepfner, C. Stern, and S. G. Nummedal et al (1971); Center for the Study of Evaluation and Early Childhood Research Center.

CSE Elementary School Test Evaluations; R. Hoepfner et al (1970); Center for the Study of Evaluation.

CSE-RBS Test Evaluations: Tests of Higher Order Cognitive, Affective, and Interpersonal Skills; R. Hoepfner et al (1972); Center for the Study of Evaluation and Research for Better Schools, Inc.

2.3 Criterion-Referenced Tests in English only from the Instructional Objectives Exchange; Two parallel forms for pre and posttesting on pre-printed spirit masters to assess Reading (K-6), Math (K-12), Science (K-6), and Social Studies (K-6, 10-12); Includes a manual describing the amplified objectives which the tests are assessing; Also available are instructional objectives collections covering 45 areas, including Spanish (7-12), "self- concept" (K-12), "attitude to school" (K-12), and "attitude to tolerance" (9-12); Available from: Instructional Objectives Exchange
P.O. Box 24095
Los Angles, California 90024

2.4 SOBER - ESPANOL; Instructional objectives in Spanish with test items are being developed at the Center for the Study of Evaluation; The System for Objectives-Based Evaluation of Reading (SOBER) will cover reading in Spanish for both native Spanish speakers and students for whom Spanish is a second language in grades K-12; Information available from:
Dr. Ricardo Cornejo
Center for the Study of Evaluation
UCLA Graduate School of Education
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024

3.0 OTHER ANNOTATED LISTS OF TESTS:

3.1 Evaluation Instruments for Bilingual Education; D. Hamilton under the direction of Joanna Chambers of the Dissemination Center for Bilingual Bicultural Education; Designed as a directory of published and staff-developed tests from Title VII programs, the booklet is a revision of Tests in Use in Title VII Bilingual Education Projects; Information, when available, consists of: I. Test Title, Alternate Title, Acronym, Author, Publisher or Source, Date, Pages, and Price; II. Age, Grade, Time, Language, Group/Individual Administration; and III. Skills, Special Requirements, and Sources; Available from:
Juan D. Solis, Director
Dissemination Center for Bilingual
Bicultural Education
6504 Tracor Lane
Austin, Texas 78721

3.2 Analytical Bibliography of Language Tests; J. G. Savard of Laval University in Quebec; Text in French only; Published for the

International Center for Research on Bilingualism, the bibliography lists over 400 tests for primary, secondary, and college levels in ten languages, including second language tests, mother tongue tests, bilingual tests, language aptitude tests, and psychological tests; Information, when available, is included regarding level, time for administration, time for correction, and coefficients of reliability and validity; The bibliography also contains a list of addresses from which the tests may be obtained; Available for $10.00 from:

Les Presses de
L'Université Laval
P.O. Box 2447
Quebec 2, Canada

4.0 TESTS ON FILE:

The Bilingual Education Applied Research Unit (BEARU) has copies of published and staff-developed tests used in Title VII bilingual projects on file which may be compared for selection purposes. Copies of test critiques such as the CSE-ECRC Preschool/Kindergarten Test Evaluations and the CSE Elementary School Test Evaluations are also available, as are reviews from Buros' Mental Measurements Handbook.

The Bilingual Education Applied Research Unit is located at:

Hunter College
Room 310
560 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10022

-Sources of Information compiled by:

Marietta Saravia Shore
Bilingual Education Applied
Research Unit

From TESTS IN SPANISH AND OTHER LANGUAGES, ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE, AND NON VERBAL TESTS FOR BILINGUAL PROGRAMS by Alan and Roselin Ehrlich, Bilingual Education Applied Research Unit Hunter College, 1974.

1. Research on present attitudes toward Spanish; the status in which Spanish is held by teachers, administrators, and among different sectors of the community.
2. Research to identify factors which contribute significantly to the status of a language (political, legal, percent of population which speaks the language, type of exposure speakers received in the communications media). What image/stereotypes of the Hispanic Community and Latin America are conveyed in the media?
3. Sociolinguistic research on patterns of language use and maintenance in different domains outside of school depending on whether or not students are in a) Maintenance program b) no bilingual program:
   a) For what situations, content and between which persons is Spanish used as compared to English? (See Fishman.)
   b) Research directed toward efforts at attitudinal change in reference to the status of Spanish:

      Which methods work most effectively?
   c) Research on the extent of efforts to inform communities and school staff about bilingual education. How are administrators, teachers, and parents being informed about bilingual education: How do different efforts and media relate to the effect on local school staffing patterns? On one way or two way program?
4. Research on attitudes of parents, teachers, principals, assistant principal and district coordinators toward the role of the school in changing the present social structure so that Hispanics would have equal access to a range of positions.

a) Do parents see bilingual education as beneficial for their children for future economic opportunities?

b) Do parents view bilingual education as beneficial for their children's general achievement?

c) Which model (s) of bilingual education do parents want? Developmental/ transitional?

d) Research to explore how teachers and administrators view their own roles in implementing bilingual education.

5. Research on the law and bilingual education:

   a) How is Title VII interpreted?

   b How are Lau Guidelines being interpreted?

   c How is ASPIRA being interpreted by school decision makers?

6. Review and documentation of the administrative institutionalization of the Office of Bilingual Education within the New York City Board of Education.

   To what extent has it been institutionalized? How much policy making power does it have?

7. Personnel procedures of the N.Y.C. Board of Education related to the hiring of Hispanic personnel.

8. Criteria for assignment of students to bilingual classrooms in New York City, and policy toward students whose parents wish to have their children in bilingual programs if they are English dominant or bilingual (rather than limited in English).

LINGUISTICS

Carmen Dinos

1. Research to identify the extent of teachers' and supervisors' knowledge of, or misunderstanding about, the field of linguistics, and their attitudes toward bilingual education.

   For example, teachers' and supervisors':

   a) understanding of the nature of language,

   b) attitudes related to the form of language (dialect) used by the learners and their parents and

   c) attitudes related to the philosophy and theory concerning TESL and bilingual bicultural education and its application throughout all levels of education from kindergarten through college.

2. Extent of inclusion of linguistics at the undergraduate and graduate levels in teacher training for bilingual education; inclusion of linguistics in pre-service and in-service courses.

3. Criteria of competence for bilingual teachers:

   a) ability to fully communicate with learners, their parents and the the larger community

   b) proficiency and levels of literacy in their first and second language

   c) ability to deal with the cultural implications of the learner's background

   d) ability to develop different strategies for the acquisition of second language skills so that they match the learning styles of the individual learners

   e) ability to diagnose language abilities and needs in the first and second language on an ongoing basis in order to prescribe curricula

f) ability to coordinate teaching of first and second language activities with the activities of monolingual English in order to promote natural learning situations in the second language

g) ability to instill in pupils a respect and love for both languages, and pride in their native language and culture

h) ability to develop and adapt materials, including audio-visuals, for learning communication skills that reflect the linguistic, cultural and experiential backgrounds of the pupils

4. Teacher's choice of language for various learning activities.

5. Extent of input by practicioners in the field of linguistics to program design and implementation in bilingual education.

CURRICULUM DESIGN

Gerardo Torres

1. Analyze different goals and languages of instruction as perceived by "the community," publishers, educators and politicians, as implicit in curricula.
2. Analyze historical patterns of curriculum implementation: which interest groups selected the content, structure and format? Which interest groups advocated changes? How did changes occur?
3. Analyze classroom processes/implementation of existing curricula for bilingual programs.
4. Which psychological theories are prevalent within current monolingual and bilingual curricula?
5. Which psychological theories are relevant to the ways in which bilingual children learn?
6. Analyze the structure of various disciplines and the methodologies by which they are taught, and select the most effective sequences of learning processes for each discipline as they relate to the child's linguistic and cognitive development.
7. Synthesize cross cultural analyses of childrens' moral development.
8. Cost analysis and financial resources available for curriculum design and implementation.
9. Research comparing the results of utilization of humanistic modes, such as consideration of individual learning styles, with a behavioristic approach.
10. To what extent do present bilingual program curricular content and goals include immediate student needs, community needs and human needs?

REFERENCES

1. Alexenberg, Melvin L. "Toward an Integral Structure Through Science and Art." Main Currents in Modern Thought, Vol. 30, #4, March-April, 1974.

2. Grannis, Joseph C. "The School as a Model of Society," in Norman Adler and Charles Harrington, (Eds.) The Learning of Political Behavior, p. 137-148. Glenville, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1970.

3. Grannis, Joseph C. and Jackson, David E. "Columbia Classroom Environments Project Final Report, Contract No. OEC - 71-9593." New York Institute for Pedagogical Studies. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973, Mimeograph.

4. Grannis, Joseph C. "The Political Polarization of Early Childhood Pedagogies." Paper read at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting. Chicago, Illinois, 1974.

5. Grannis, Joseph C. "Community, Competence and Individuation: The Effects of Different Controls in Educational Environments." IRCD Bulletin. Institute for Urban and Minority Education. Teachers College, Columbia University and ETS, Princeton, New Jersey. Vol. X #2, Spring, 1975.

6. Krathwohl, David R., Benjamin Bloom and Bertram Masia, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Handbook II: The Affective Domain, Mackay & Co., 1964.

7. Lacey, Colin Hightown Grammar: The School as a Social System, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970.

8. Ogbu, John, The Next Generation, Academic Press, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1974.

9. Ramirez, Manuel, III, and Alfredo Casteneda, Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development and Education New York and London: Academic Press, 1974.

10. Rist, Ray C. The Urban School: A Factory for Failure. A Study of Education in American Society. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973.

11. Saville - Troike, Muriel, Bilingual Children: A Resource Document, Papers in Applied Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

12. Stufflebeam, Daniel L. et. al., Educational Evaluation and Decision Making Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee on Evaluation, Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1971

Participants in Research Needs Workshop Willing to Participate in

Statewide Advisory Group to Critique

Bilingual Education Research

1) Ada Anglada
BGAC Teachers College
Box 11
Columbia University
N.Y.C., N.Y. 10027

2) Jose Baldassini
Division of Humanities
221 E. 71st Street
Marymount Manhattan College
New York, N.Y. 10021

3) Francine Frank
Linguistics Program
HU 245
(Ae. Dept. of Hispanic,
Italian Studies)
SUNY at Albany

4) Acte Y. Maldonado
SUNY at Albany

5) Frank Otto
11 Blessing Rd.
Slingerlands, N.Y. 12159
(Certificate Fellow S.U.N.Y. - Albany)

6) Dr. Clara Rodriguez
Dept. of Puerto Rican Studies
Lehman College
Bronx, N.Y. 10468

7) Marietta Saravia Shore
Bilingual Education
Applied Research Unit
Hunter College
560 Lexington Avenue
N.Y.C., NY 10022

8) William G. Short, Ph.D.
Instituto Interamericano
de Yucatan
Apartado Postal 12
Villa Rosita
Progreso, Yucatan Mexico
(Also SUNY at Albany)

9) Dr. Wolfgang Wolck
Linguistics and Latin
American Studies
State University of N.Y.
of Buffalo
North Campus
Buffalo, N.Y. 14261

10) Gloria Zuazua
Brooklyn College
Bedford Ave. and Ave. H
Brooklyn, New York

APPENDIX

Appendix 1

PROGRAM

THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1976

1:00 P.M. — Registration

4:00 P.M. — Moderator: Gilbert Moore, Dean
School of Education
SUNYA

Greetings:

Lewis P. Welch
Vice-President
University Affairs
SUNYA

Gerald Snyder, Chairman
Department of Instruction
School of Education, SUNYA

GENERAL SESSION

Moderator: Maria Ramirez, Coordinator
Bilingual Education Unit
New York State Education
Department

Panelists:

Arturo Gutierrez
Program Director
Bilingual Education
Texas Education
Agency

Ernest Mazzone, Director
Bureau of Transitional
Bilingual Education
Massachusetts State Department
of Education

Ned Seelye, Acting Director
Bilingual Education Section
Office of the Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Illinois

6:00 P.M. — Cocktail Party

7:00 P.M. — Banquet

PROGRAM

FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1976 (Morning Session)

9:30 A.M. — Moderator: Gilbert Sánchez, Co-Director
Bilingual Education Program
SUNYA

GENERAL SESSION

Greetings: Emmett Fields
President, SUNYA

Introductory Remarks: Carmen A. Pérez, Co-Director
Bilingual Education Program
SUNYA

Keynote Address: Cándido DeLeón, President
Hostos Community College

10:30 A.M. — Coffee Break

10:45 A.M. — Workshops

The Workshops are designed to promote discussion of some important issues affecting bilingual education at a higher educational level. It is expected that recommendations and suggestions will be made in each area.

PROGRAM

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1976 (Morning Session) Continued

Workshops:

Topic	Discussion Leaders	Recorders
Coordination of Undergraduate and Graduate Bilingual Education Curriculum	Genaro Marín Isabel Sirgado	Felipe Pistiner
Lobbying for Bilingual Education	Robert García Lee Wolff	Luz Torres
Improving Literacy Skills in Two Languages	Gloria Zuazua Edgar Rodriguez	Acté Maldonado
Articulation Between Institutes of Higher Education and Local Educational Agencies	Awilda Orta Armando Cotayo	Ana Villegas
Bilingual Education and the Monolingual English Speakers	José Vázquez James Ward	Jon Strolle

12:15 P.M. Lunch

Appendix 1

PROGRAM

FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1976 (Afternoon Session)

1:30 P.M. — Moderator: Genis Meléndez
Visiting Lecturer, Bilingual Education Program, SUNYA

GENERAL SESSION

Keynote Address: Sonia Rivera, Director
Bilingual Education Program
Luis D. Brandeis High School

2:30 P.M. — Coffee Break

2:45 P.M. — Workshops:

Topic	Discussion Leaders	Recorders
The Role of Foreign Languages and Ethnic Studies in Bilingual Education	Edna Acosta-Belén Charles Hancock	John Mulhern
Assessing Competencies in Bilingual Education	Migdalia Romero Lourdes Travieso	Rosa María Cotayo
Research in Bilingual Education	Marietta Shore Raymond Sullivan	Frank Otto
Certification for Bilingual Education	John Borel Gilbert Sanchez	Barbara Sjostrom
ESL in Bilingual Education	Richard Light Mary Hines	George Theofanis-López

RESOLUTION #2
PASSED BY THE TESOL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, MARCH 5, 1976, NEW YORK

ON TEACHER CERTIFICATION

Whereas a most important purpose of TESOL, as stated in the Constitution, is to strengthen at all levels instruction in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages; and

Whereas this objective can only be achieved through assuring quality teacher preparation and certification; and

Whereas these matters are a prime concern to TESOL;

Be it resolved that the TESOL organization take an energetic lead in the area of teacher certification in the following ways:

* the First Vice-President of TESOL utilize liaison already established with other professional organizations in connection with the Interassociational Consortium of the Sociopolitical Concerns of Minority Groups Committee, to identify and work toward compatible and appropriate certification goals in bilingual education and English to speakers of other languages;
* the First Vice-President of TESOL work with the affiliates and the Task Force on Teacher Preparation and Certification of the Schools and Universities Coordinating Committee,to actively promote teacher certification in the areas of English to speakers of other languages and bilingual education;
* the First Vice-President of TESOL assist the affiliates in strengthening communication with local, state and governmental agencies, informing these agencies of existing guidelines and appropriate accreditation recommendations in the area of bilingual education and English to speakers of other languages.

ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Note: These recommendations had originally been appended to the Resolution on Certification as a footnote; they were given a sense of endorsement at the Legislative Assembly March 5, 1976.

1. Inasmuch as instruction to multilingual groups and instruction to monolingual groups differ, it is recommended that the states approve two separate accreditation or endorsement arrangements in the areas of TESOL and bilingual education.
2. It is recommended that a TESOL component be included in the bilingual education certification. It is also recommended that a cultural component be included in the TESOL certification.
3. a. It is recommended that rigorous training, equivalent to a full undergraduate major or a master's degree, including field-based experience under qualified supervision in the respective TESOL or bilingual areas, be required.
   b. It is recommended that individual states give serious consideration to the current professional guidelines prepared by TESOL and NABE.
4. Recognizing that the modes of language learning differ at the elementary and secondary school levels both cognitively and affectively, and that effective teaching at these levels requires an understanding of the child and his learning processes at whatever age level one meets him, it is recommended that separate accreditation/endorsement be provided in the elementary and secondary areas, and that this include field experience and methodology at the appropriate level.
5. It is recommended that comparable guidelines be followed in respect to supervision of ESL/Bilingual Programs.
6. It is recommended that similar evaluation also apply to teachers and supervisors of adult programs and other specialized programs in the area of TESOL and bilingual education funded by the state.

RESOLUTION #3
PASSED BY THE TESOL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, MARCH 5, 1976, NEW YORK

RESOLUTION ON CBTE

Whereas Competency Based Teacher Education has been mandated as the sole, or preferred, model of teacher education in certain states, and has created much discussion about its rationale and viability,

Be it resolved that TESOL adopt the following statement, and instruct the First Vice President to disseminate this statement to TESOL affiliates, other professional organizations, and interested parties.

TESOL renews its support for the following trends associated with competency-based teacher education: statement of goals, field orientation, cooperation of institutions in consortia, multiple approaches to teacher preparation, and the evaluation of teacher competence.

Other aspects associated with CBTE give us concern: (1) the specificity of so-called competencies in terms of testable performances in a way which implies solely a behaviorist learning theory; and (2) the neglect of the affective domain because of difficulty in observation, measurement and evaluation. We prefer higher order statements of competence which include such cognitive capacities as understanding, application, interpretation, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. We are opposed to a model of teacher education which perceives the teacher primarily as a technician. We prefer a model firmly rooted in the humanistic tradition in which the preparation of teachers and supervisors includes a sound general education, in addition to an academic specialization and professional education.

In addition, we are opposed to premature mandates for CBTE by State Departments of Education, acting with encouragement from the USOE. Instead, we recommend that professional and administrative energies be directed to further research into identifying the clusters of abilities that contribute to effective language learning and teaching.

The resolutions on teacher certification and on competency-based teacher education were developed and submitted by the following persons:

Palmer Acheson
Paul Angelis
Larry Bouton
Karl Diller
John Fanselow
Janet Fisher
Pat Furey
Mary Galvan
Mary Hines
Richard L. Light, Chairman
Harold Madsen
Adele Martinez
Dorothy Messerschmitt
Harvey Nadler
James Ney
William Norris
Clifford Prator
Alice Perlman
Migdalia Romero de Ortiz
Gil Sanchez
Joyce Valdez
Margaret van Naerssen

We, the undersigned bilingual educators assembled at the New York State Conference on Bilingual Education in Colleges and Universities in Albany, New York on the 14th of May, 1976, respectively request the following from the New York State Legislature

That Hostos Community College be able to continue its unique bilingual education program in higher education at its present site where it has contributed greatly to the revitalization of the community.

That sufficient funding be allocated so that the present bilingual education program will continue to grow, through bill A 11855 introduced by Assemblyman Louis Nine. This bill will provide funds to save Hostos Community College, the only college in New York State which meets the multiple needs of the Spanish speaking community. Through its program of intensive English for Spanish speakers and its continuing education program in Spanish, a cadre of people are being trained in the professions of social services which serve the growing Spanish speaking population of New York State.
Hostos Community College, a symbol of hope and achievement for the Spanish speaking people of New York and the United States must be saved!

Maria Malave - Staten Island Community College
Dr. Richard Light SUNYA
William Talbot
Muriel Pagán
Wolfgang Wölck SUNYA
Jorge Mora, Manhattan Comm. College
Magdalena Romero de Ortiz (Hunter Coll.)
SUNY New Paltz
Genis Melendez SUNYA
Marietta Saravia Shore
Bilingual Education Research Unit - Hunter College
College of CUNY III

Juan José Guerrero SUNY-Albany

Barbara Spectrum SUNY - Albany

Susan Sardy

Judy Ann Bond Albany

[illegible] N.M. College

[illegible]

Wilbur D. Hunt SUNY - Albany

Instituto Interamericano de Yucatán
Progreso, México

Ada Anglada BGAC - Teachers College
Box H
Columbia University

Celeste J. Maldonado - SUNY at Albany

Frank Otto - S.U.N.Y. - Albany

Frances Jank SUNY Albany